

SENATE.

SATURDAY, August 12, 1916.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we are the stewards of the ever-increasing wealth of Thy providence and grace. We are the guardians of the sacred rights of men. We have been intrusted with many things pertaining to those riches of life that have been bought with blood. We desire to be faithful to our trust, to hold in reverence Thy name, to advance the interest of Thy kingdom, to increase the happiness of mankind.

Grant us this day Thy grace that our hearts may be opened to every appeal God will make to us, and our hands ready to serve, our lives consecrated to the great purpose of God in human life. Do Thou take away from us every evil thought from our hearts, every unholy thing, and may we serve God with singleness of heart and purpose. For Christ's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, August 10, 1916, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a petition of sundry citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PHELAN presented petitions of the Chamber of Commerce of Petaluma and of the Chamber of Commerce of Santa Paula, in the State of California, praying for the settlement of the difficulties between the railroads and their employees by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a memorial of the Bettes Pharmacy, of Jacksonville, Fla., remonstrating against a tax on each 8 ounces of any preparation containing either wine or alcohol, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from W. D. Tidwell, of Denver, Colo., remonstrating against a tax on freight and express bills of lading, telephone and telegraph messages, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRADY. I present telegrams which I have received from citizens in my State, relating to the proposed tax on copper, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALLACE, IDAHO, August 10, 1916.

HON. JAMES H. BRADY,
United States Senate:

We desire to protest against that portion of a revenue bill now before the Senate by which it is proposed to levy a tax upon copper. It is the opinion of this body that the proposed tax is unfair and unjust for the following reasons: First, that it is not uniform taxation; second, that it singles out only one of the metals produced in this country, thus placing an undue burden on one industry; third, while it is presumed that it is the intention to tax abnormal copper profits, no provision is made for abolition of the tax when copper prices become normal; fourth, that it is retroactive to January 1, 1916, thus placing a burden upon producers and manufacturers not contemplated in transactions already closed and on which they have no opportunity to protect themselves.

We trust that you will use every effort in your power to prevent the enactment of said tax.

WALLACE BOARD OF TRADE,
M. A. CORNER, President.

WALLACE, IDAHO, August 10, 1916.

HON. JAMES H. BRADY,
United States Senate:

The revenue bill which passed the House on July 8 and is now before the Senate proposed, among other things, a tax on copper production which seems to me very unfair. I do not know why copper should be selected for this purpose in preference to any other commodity. If this principle is accepted and more revenue is needed, the same tax may be applied to any other of the metals. I hope there is no chance for the passage of this bill in its present form.

JAMES F. MCCARTHY,
WALLACE, IDAHO, August 10, 1916.

HON. JAMES H. BRADY,
United States Senate:

We desire to protest against the enactment of the proposed tax on copper embodied in the revenue bill now in the Senate. Believe this tax to be unfair in that it singles out one industry and places upon it an undue burden of taxation; also, that it is unfair in that it is retroactive, taxing business already disposed of in which no opportunity was had to cover this additional expense; and that no provision is made for the abolition of the tax when the price of copper is again normal. Hope you will do all you can to defeat the passage of this tax.

FEDERAL MINING & SMELTING CO.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I present a petition in favor of the workmen's compensation bill, signed by something like 300 members of Detroit Branch, No. 1, National Association of Letter Carriers. I ask to have the body of the petition printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETROIT BRANCH, No. 1.
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Detroit, Mich., August 10, 1916.

HON. CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned members of Detroit Branch, No. 1, National Association of Letter Carriers, respectfully invite your attention to the Kern-McGillcuddy workmen's compensation bill for injured Federal employees.

This bill passed the House of Representatives on July 12, 1916, by a vote of 285 ayes to 3 nays.

We understand that it has been reported favorably to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and now has a place on the Senate calendar.

As the law would be of particular benefit to the letters carriers, we are very anxious to have it pass this session without amendment. Therefore your petitioners very respectfully solicit your cooperation and assistance in getting early action taken thereon.

S. W. ARKENBRANDT, Secretary
(And others).

Mr. TOWNSEND. I present a telegram from William Livingston, one of the prominent bankers of Michigan, chairman of the Detroit Clearing House Association and former president of the National Bankers' Association, and a telegram from William J. Gray, president of the Michigan Bankers' Association, in reference to the special bank tax which, the papers have suggested, is to be restored by the Senate committee. I move that the telegrams be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. I present telegrams from William Thompson, of Lewiston, Idaho; the First National Bank, the Commercial National Bank, and the St. Anthony Bank & Trust Co., of St. Anthony, Idaho; the Board of Trade, the Federal Mining & Smelting Co., and from James F. McCarthy, of Wallace, Idaho; from the National Defense League, of San Francisco, Cal.; and from W. D. Tidwell, of Denver, Colo., all touching on the revenue bill which, I understand, will soon be considered by the Senate. I move that the telegrams be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. I present a telegram in the nature of a memorial from Ralph S. Stacy, president of the Washington State Bankers' Association, remonstrating against reinstating in the revenue bill the special bankers' tax. I move that the telegram be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance a telegram which I have received from W. D. Tidwell, of Denver, Colo., regarding a stamp tax on freight and express bills of lading and telephone and telegraph messages.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., August 11, 1916.

CHAS. CURTIS, Washington, D. C.:

The organization which I represent, composed of 12,000 growers, shippers, and distributors of fruits and vegetables living in central, middle, and far western country, earnestly, but vigorously, protest against amending H. R. 16763 to keep in effect stamp tax on freight and express bills of lading, telephone and telegraph messages. Perishable industry carried on by long-distance phone and telegrams. Shipments of freight and express are of small money value, but millions of the stamp tax falls heavily and unevenly upon this industry. Willing to pay our share to support our Government, but stamp tax an unjust burden.

W. D. TIDWELL, Secretary.

RESIGNATION OF FORMER DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, on Thursday we had some discussion about the date of the resignation of Mr. Durand as Director of the Census and the appointment of Mr. Harris. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], who I know always desires to be accurate, said that Mr. Harris's nomination was sent in first and Durand resigned a day or two afterwards, or about that time.

That the facts may be correctly presented upon this subject, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Senate records show that the nomination of Mr. Harris was made on the 17th of June. I send to the desk a copy of the resignation of Mr. Durand, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Secretary read as follows:

The honorable the SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

SIR: I beg to hand you herewith, for transmission to the President, my resignation as Director of the Census.

Very respectfully,

E. DANA DURAND.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it is thus clearly shown that the resignation of Mr. Durand antedated the nomination of Mr. Harris.

Shortly after the confirmation of Mr. Harris as Director of the Census he designated a board consisting of Mr. S. N. D. North and W. R. Merriam, former Directors of the Census; Prof. Walter F. Wilcox, of Cornell University; Chief Statistician W. S. Rossiter; and Daniel C. Roper to investigate the status of the work of the census and to make recommendations with reference to it. I ask that their report, which is short, be printed in the Record without stopping to read it.

No one can read this report without observing the numerous changes recommended to overcome the delay due to lack of proper administration by Mr. Durand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SEPTEMBER 19, 1913.

To the DIRECTOR:

In view of the facts (1) that the act for the taking of the Thirteenth and subsequent censuses requires that the reports of that census shall be completed and published on or before July 1, 1912; (2) that, although three and one-half years have now elapsed since the enumeration, much of the Thirteenth Census work is still uncompleted; (3) that the regular annual reports and other work of the intercensal period have been greatly delayed because a large body of census clerks is still employed upon the Thirteenth Census work; (4) that the value and usefulness of the annual and other reports required by law are largely dependent upon the promptness with which they are compiled and given to the public; and (5) that current appropriations are required for the purposes for which they were made.

The undersigned special agents of the Bureau of Census, instructed by the director to make studies of particular branches of statistical work in the bureau, have now partly completed their several tasks, and advise the director to begin new tabulations or analyses in connection with the unfinished branches of the Thirteenth Census, namely, population and mines and quarries, and to readjust the work on those branches and on the delayed annual reports so as to insure their publication not later than December 31, 1913.

Therefore we advise:

1. That the proposed second machine run of the cards for the purpose of tabulating occupations be abandoned, thus expediting the time of production by about six months and reducing the cost of finishing that branch by about \$65,000, and that the tables yielded by the first run of the cards be printed without derivative tables or text. These tables give the number of persons of each sex in each occupation and classify them by race, nativity, and parent nativity, and five age periods, thus insuring the publication of the primary classification of occupational data as reported at previous censuses.

2. That the report upon native tongue be limited to the chapter to appear in the forthcoming final volume on population.

3. That the tables relating to mines and quarries now in the form of printed bulletins, proofs, or manuscript be sent to the Public Printer at once, the same to constitute the final report on mines and quarries, and that no further tabulations or text be prepared in connection with that report.

4. That tables for the benevolent institutions and for the institutional population, namely, prisoners, insane and feeble-minded, and paupers, be prepared and published without percentage or other derivative tables and without analytical text.

5. That the annual compilation of the statistics of forest products be abandoned. There appears to be no authority of law for an annual inquiry of this character, which the records show to have cost from \$20,000 to \$40,000 a year.

6. That the annual report on the financial statistics of cities for 1912 be completed and published by January 1, 1914, by curtailing the amount of detail to be included; that the schedules and report for 1913 be similarly curtailed; that the reports for the years 1912 and 1913 be printed without text, except such as is necessary for explanation and definition; and that until the annual reports on the financial statistics of cities are brought up to date no attempt be made to prepare a report on general municipal statistics. This recommendation is based on the fact that delay in the compilation and publication of the annual municipal reports detracts seriously from their value.

7. That the reports on mortality statistics for the years 1911 and 1912 be published before the close of the present calendar year. To make this possible, the text of these reports should be reduced to a minimum or omitted, the tables condensed, and no effort made to publish a report on births until the mortality reports are published.

8. That work upon the standardization of death rates, life tables, and occupational mortality be suspended until the above reports have been published. There is no reason why the mortality report for each year should not be compiled and published prior to the close of the succeeding calendar year.

9. That the emergency presented by the delay in completing the Thirteenth Census justifies the director in requesting the Secretary of Commerce to lay the matter before the President with the view of securing his instructions to the Public Printer to give precedence, so far as practicable, to the remaining publications of the Thirteenth Census and the annual reports long overdue.

The undersigned special agents of the Bureau of Census submit these recommendations. They will severally give their attention to the various questions submitted to each of them by the director and prepare further memoranda for his consideration at an early date.

APPOINTMENT OF SUPERINTENDENT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I should like to make a similar request to clear up the proposition as to whether Mr. Jones

is a horse doctor or not. Mr. Sweet, a high official of the Treasury Department, wrote to Mr. Hughes to the effect—I quote his exact words:

Dr. Jones never was a veterinary surgeon.

I do not want in the slightest degree to reflect upon this noble profession, which is most useful in the community, but it does seem incongruous to those who are interested in good government to put a horse doctor at the head of the Coast Survey.

I have here a copy of one of Dr. Jones's prescriptions, a facsimile of which I will ask to have inserted in the Record.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is this being done under unanimous consent? Has unanimous consent been requested?

Mr. PENROSE. I am taking the opportunity afforded the Senator from Georgia. I did not object.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon; I propounded a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair—not to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is unable to state whether the Senator from Pennsylvania is taking advantage of the presentation of petitions and memorials or not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Pennsylvania just stated that he wanted to read a letter or an affidavit of some description.

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator from Mississippi will permit me, the Senator from Georgia, without objection, opened up this subject, and in order to throw further light on it I am going to ask to have inserted in the Record—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, the Senator from Pennsylvania having confessed his object is to show further argument, I object.

Mr. PENROSE. All right. I will take an opportunity later in the day to read it as a part of my remarks.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

Mr. SHAFROTH. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably, with an amendment, Senate resolution 244 authorizing the Committee on Finance to hold hearings and employ a stenographer, and I desire the consideration of the resolution now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry regarding this resolution. Is it contemplated to employ a stenographer to report hearings before the majority members of the Finance Committee to the exclusion of the minority, as has been the practice heretofore?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not think that is the purpose of the resolution. It is in the usual form. The question is as to whether and how he is to be used and to what extent is to be determined by the committee. This simply authorizes the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, to employ a stenographer at the regular rate, and it is presented with an amendment striking out the authority to send for persons and papers, because that is something that the committee has concluded there ought to be a special request for and a showing before the committee before it is authorized.

The resolution is simply an authorization for the committee to employ a stenographer at the rate of \$1 per printed page.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that last year a similar resolution was passed, and if we pass this resolution, of course, it will cover the hearings which have already been held before the subcommittees appointed from the majority. That is the object of the resolution. The hearings have already been held, the printing done, and this, of course, is to authorize the payment for the reporting.

Mr. SIMMONS. I did not hear the Senator's last sentence.

Mr. SMOOT. I said the hearings had been held and this is to pay for work already done.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Utah has covered what I wished to say. It is the usual custom to pass resolutions of this sort at the beginning of each Congress. I found a few days ago that the last resolution of this character had expired by limitation and that it was necessary to pass another to pay for a stenographer.

Mr. PENROSE. Of course, there would be no objection to the resolution if the hearings were before the full committee or a subcommittee upon which the minority were represented. Just why the contingent fund of the Senate should be drawn upon to pay the expense of the Democratic caucus I fail to understand. These hearings were strictly partisan.

I understand that three or four subcommittees have been appointed from the Finance Committee, consisting of three each, every one a Democrat. I have not been invited, as the ranking member of the minority, to participate in any of the hearings. I do not know whether I would have been let into the room if I had asked admission. I have not been able to get any information as to the progress that is being made. Just why the contingent fund of the Senate should be drawn on to take down the proceedings of the Democratic caucus I fail to understand.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is entirely mistaken if he supposes that any person has been employed by the Democratic caucus to take down anything.

We had a stenographer but a very few days, and only then he was taking down testimony taken in the open before one of the subcommittees of the Democratic membership investigating the munitions tax and one investigating matters connected with the income and tariff tax. I do not suppose that the entire expense incurred up to this time will be more than \$15 or \$20. Those hearings have been open. Those hearings were insisted upon by Members on both sides, and they have been conducted just exactly like similar hearings have always been conducted heretofore, and they have been printed and are in the hands of Senators.

Mr. PENROSE. Does the Senator as the chairman of the committee contend for a moment that any of the minority were permitted to be present to cross-examine the witnesses?

Mr. SIMMONS. If they had desired to be present and cross-examine the witnesses, they could have been present and cross-examined them.

Mr. PENROSE. That was not the understanding while it was going on.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have never heard that the Senator from Pennsylvania desired to be present. The hearings of the subcommittee were absolutely open. Hundreds of people were here to be heard, and they were heard, as many of them as desired, as spokesmen and representatives of certain delegations that came here. There has been no deviation from the usual custom in reference to these hearings. We thrashed out here this thing yesterday morning. The Senator was not here at the time. The trouble is that the Senator does not stay here all the time, and when he comes in he wants to take up something that has been here before.

Mr. SHAFROTH. This is a matter which does not affect the question of the consideration of the resolution, because this is an authority given to the committee to do this thing. If there has been a violation of the terms of it, the Senator from Pennsylvania has a right to appear before the Auditing Committee of the Senate and object to the payment of the bill. So far, however, as the authority of the committee to employ a stenographer is concerned, surely the Finance Committee is not going to be denied that right, whether it be under a Republican administration or under a Democratic administration. I repeat, as to whether there is a violation of the authority given, whether the terms of it are complied with, is a matter for the Senator to object to when the bill is presented to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. For that reason, it seems to me, Mr. President, that this resolution ought to be adopted.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

Mr. PENROSE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. WORKS. The chairman of the Committee on Finance has referred to a subcommittee. I should like to ask whether those committees are composed wholly of majority Members or whether they are composed of both majority and minority Members?

Mr. SIMMONS. I have before stated, if the Senator please, that that has been the custom as to all tariff legislation. The bills have first been prepared by the majority Members and then submitted to the full committee.

Mr. WORKS. I was not asking as to the custom. I was asking for the fact in the present instance.

Mr. SIMMONS. I stated that that was the fact. If that is what the Senator desires to know, that is the fact.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I do not consider that this stenographer has been employed by the Committee on Finance.

I do not consider that the Democratic majority of that committee is the committee or that any subcommittee of the Finance Committee that does not have a minority representation on it is a subcommittee of the Committee on Finance or of any other committee of this body. It is purely and simply a partisan proceeding, of which we get scanty information from day to day in the newspapers. The majority members of the Finance Committee meet in secret session and determine on something and then report to the Democratic caucus, according to the newspapers. We are legislating here in this Capitol without any record of the vote, without any record of the proceedings, leaving the Republicans in this Chamber to maintain a quorum while the majority Members are absent, paying no attention whatever to the arguments and speeches of the minority Members against many of the measures which are pending here.

It is not an official investigation which is being pursued by the Finance Committee, because there are no minority Members on any of these subcommittees or on the subcommittee considering the revenue measure. If this resolution could be amended—and I do not know whether or not the Senator would object to such an amendment—by the addition of this proviso, "Provided, That the said stenographer shall be present at all Democratic caucuses and take down a correct statement of the proceedings, with the yeas-and-nays vote upon every question and amendment," I would cheerfully agree to the passage of the resolution.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, this resolution is in the usual form. It relates simply to the employment of a stenographer who, under the resolution, will report all of the proceedings which the committee may desire to have reported at the next session of Congress. Consequently the resolution does not relate to what has been done particularly; but if there is any violation of the terms of that resolution, then, as I have said, will be the time for the Senator from Pennsylvania to appear before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and object to the payment of the stenographer.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, during the last presidential election one of the leading features of that "uplift campaign" was the importance of the flood tide of publicity upon all public proceedings. Now, why should the Democratic caucus be held in the dark? Is there anything transpiring there that would be disagreeable to the Senator to have printed for the information of the American people?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No. So far as I am concerned, I believe in open caucuses.

Mr. PENROSE. There the Senator has succeeded in overcoming his belief in that matter very successfully.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, the truth of the matter is that the more secrecy you have in a caucus the more certainly the newspapers will have printed in the morning exactly what occurred. As a means of publicity the best thing on earth is to call for a caucus.

Mr. SIMMONS. May I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have noticed in the newspapers that the Republican Members had a meeting a day or two ago with reference to the order of legislation—a conference or caucus, or whatever you may call it. Was that an open meeting, with the doors open to the public?

Mr. PENROSE. I do not think there would have been any objection to anyone being present. The doors were not closed that I know of, and the chairman of the caucus gave out the result of the proceedings to the public.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; and so did we.

Mr. PENROSE. That was done by direction of the conference.

Mr. SIMMONS. And so as to our conference, but I asked the question, and I should like to have the Senator answer directly, or indirectly, if he prefers that course, whether at that particular caucus, which was held within the last two or three days by the Republican Members, the doors were open and the public were invited to come in and to look upon their deliberations?

Mr. PENROSE. It was not a caucus, Mr. President; and the Republicans in the Senate of the United States have never held a caucus. I challenge the Senator from North Carolina to point to an instance where the Republicans in this body have held caucuses, so called, to determine the details of legislation. He can not do it.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Pennsylvania is now escaping under the cover of a term. I will ask the Senator if that was not a private meeting at which only Republicans were present, and was it not for the purpose of ascertaining what

the Republican Members desired to do with reference to the program of legislation? It does not make any difference whether you call that a church meeting or a caucus or a conference; you may use any term you desire; but I suppose it would mean substantially the same thing, if the meeting were a meeting of the minority membership, and only of the minority membership, for the purpose of passing upon some matter pertaining to legislation.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, the meeting was a conference to consider certain propositions of the majority relating to the legislative program. I repeat that I challenge the Senator from North Carolina to cite an instance where the Republicans of this body have ever held a conference or a caucus—call it whichever you may—to consider legislation, and binding Members participating in that conference, against their consciences and their convictions, to vote, when the bill comes out on the floor of the Senate, in accordance with the majority action.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the statement which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] makes is correct. When the Republican Party was in power the Republican Senators held no caucuses. It was not necessary that they should do so, for there was a man then in the Senate from Rhode Island who got his orders from the great interests in New York; he delivered them here, and they were obeyed. There was then no necessity for a caucus. One man dictated and controlled the Republican policies here.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, that is such an ancient chestnut that it was hardly worth while for the Senator from Colorado to get up and give vent to such a statement. It is not true.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that if the misfortune of another Republican majority should be inflicted upon the country the Senator from Pennsylvania will aspire to the toga which fell from the shoulders of the Rhode Island statesman.

Mr. PENROSE. The statement is not true, Mr. President. At no time could the Republicans during the enactment of tariff legislation command the full party vote in this body, but more frequently they were able to get the different schedules through the help of Senators from Louisiana and other Democratic States. And I, for one, were the fact as stated, would rather be advised by a Member of this body than by the occupant of the White House coming down here on personal visits, contrary to custom and even to law and decency, and inducing Democratic Senators to reverse the convictions of a lifetime and pass legislation which they loathe and despise in their inner minds.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. PENROSE. It is up, and I suppose we can discuss it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We have been pretty liberal about it.

Mr. PENROSE. I certainly shall object to it, if it is not to be discussed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the resolution will go to the calendar.

Mr. PENROSE. If discussion will be permitted, I shall not object.

Mr. SHAFROTH. How long a discussion?

Mr. PENROSE. I can not tell the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I call for the regular order, then, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (S. 6841) to enlarge the scope and purpose of the post-office building at Syracuse, N. Y., asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLIS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 5800) to provide for the use of public-school buildings in the District of Columbia as community forums, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 782) thereon.

Mr. WEEKS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 99) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to grant the free use, for military drill, of any discarded rifles to any duly accredited camps of the Sons of Veterans Reserve, reported it with amendments.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16532) authorizing an adjustment of the boundaries of the Whitman National Forest, in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 783) thereon.

Mr. POMERENE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14822) to prevent and punish the desecration, mutilation, or improper use, within the District of Columbia, of the flag of the United States of America, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 784) thereon.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11474) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to permit the construction of a public highway through the fish-cultural station in Unicoi County, Tenn., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 781) thereon.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6904) authorizing the conveyance of the United States jail and land on which the same is located at Guthrie, Okla., to Logan County, Okla., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 785) thereon.

SURVEYS OF DISTILLERIES.

Mr. GALLINGER. From the Committee on Finance I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 9542) to amend the second paragraph of section 3264 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by section 5 of the act of March 1, 1879, and as further amended by the act of Congress approved June 22, 1910, and I submit a report (No. 780) thereon. I call to the attention of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. Let the bill be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order. For what purpose is the bill being read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands it is for unanimous consent.

Mr. PENROSE. I object to the consideration of the measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes to the calendar.

MEMORIAL TO JOHN ERICSSON.

Mr. CLAPP. In behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], from the Committee on the Library, I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 5) for erecting a suitable memorial to John Ericsson, and I submit a report (No. 777) thereon. The bill has passed the House, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let us have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$35,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized for the erection, in the city of Washington, D. C., of a suitable memorial to John Ericsson, the inventor and constructor of the *Monitor*, said sum to be expended for the purposes herein named by a commission consisting of the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives, and the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided,* That the design and location of said memorial and the plan for the treatment of the grounds connected with its site shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COLORADO RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 16914) permitting the Needles & Oatman Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Colorado River between the States of California and Arizona, and I submit a report (No. 778) thereon. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAVANNAH RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 16905) granting the consent of Congress to A. N. Alford to construct a bridge across the Savannah River, and I submit a report (No. 779) thereon. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. SHAFROTH. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably without amendment Senate resolution 228, authorizing the Committee on Claims to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had. As there is nothing political in this, I hope that the resolution will be adopted.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Claims, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fourth Congress, to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 6846) granting an increase of pension to David Craft (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 6847) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Quimby (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 6848) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Batteiger (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 6850) authorizing the transfer of certain retired Army officers to the active list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 6851) to provide for the establishment of national cooperative banking associations;

A bill (S. 6852) to create a national rural-credit society for the purpose of promoting agricultural credit, of devising forms of obligations eligible for rediscount at Federal reserve banks and acceptable as security for Federal deposits of acting as fiscal agent for the United States Government, and of establishing a suitable form of investment for postal savings bank funds, trust funds in possession of United States courts or departments, and time deposits in national banks; and

A bill (S. 6853) to provide for the establishment of national cooperative rural banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 6854) to repeal the last proviso of section 4 of an act to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, approved January 26, 1915; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 6855) for the taking depositions de bene esse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 6856) granting an increase of pension to Henry Arthur (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 163) for an investigation of the live-stock and meat-packing industries and of certain corporations engaged in purchasing live stock and in the packing and distribution of meats; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

STORAGE OF EXPLOSIVES.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I introduce a bill and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. Did I understand the Senator to say that he merely introduced the bill?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I introduce the bill and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. The bill ought to be referred to a committee.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, I do not know how long that will take. Let the Secretary read the bill, after which I should like to make a brief statement in regard to it.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the Secretary reading the bill.

The bill (S. 6849) to regulate the shipment and storage of explosives was read twice by its title.

Mr. PENROSE. Let the bill go to a committee.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, my purpose in introducing the bill and asking unanimous consent for its present consideration is the vital necessity for immediate action. We are all aware that a few weeks ago there were stored

at Jersey City ammunition and explosives designed for the bel-ligerents on the other side of the water, and that from some cause, whether by accident or design is not known, a great explosion ensued, which resulted in property damage of over \$50,000,000 and involved great loss of life. A similar catastrophe is likely to occur unless some such step as is proposed in this bill shall be taken, whereby the storage of ammunition and other high explosives in the midst of any city shall be barred, without the consent of its corporate power.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it is manifest that this bill is of sufficient importance to go to a committee; in fact, no bill should be considered without reference to a committee. I therefore object to its present consideration, and suggest that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEE of Maryland submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$475.45 to pay Ella Warfield, widow of John A. Warfield, deceased, for injuries received by him while in the discharge of his duties as assistant engineer of the United States Treasury Department, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

W. W. WALL.

Mr. STONE. I ask unanimous consent that Order of Business 617, House bill 1373, for the relief of W. W. Wall, be re-committed to the Committee on Claims. It is a bill which has been reported adversely.

Mr. PENROSE. What is the nature of the bill?

Mr. STONE. It is a claims bill for the relief of W. W. Wall.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, just a moment.

Mr. STONE. I ask that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

C. HORATIO SCOTT.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, several days ago, when the calendar was under consideration, I happened to be absent from the Chamber for a few moments when Order of Business 632, being the bill (H. R. 4559) for the relief of C. Horatio Scott, was reached. On account of my absence the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] stated that he objected to the consideration of the bill, which is a small claims bill, reported by me. I understand the Senator has examined the bill and does not object to its consideration. If any other Senator has any objection to the measure, I will not, as I am about to do, ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration; but I am obliged to leave the Chamber, and I think this case, although a small affair, of course, and relating to but one individual, is of extreme importance to him.

I will state briefly the object of the bill, and if there is any objection I will not press my request, of course. The bill provides for refunding to the postmaster at Sault Ste. Marie \$596.52 on account of the embezzlement of the deputy postmaster, whom the postmaster inherited. The postmaster discovered that the accounts of the deputy were wrong in small particulars, and called upon the department for an investigation. An inspector was sent there, who discovered the irregularities, but recommended that the deputy be allowed to remain until further investigation could be made. In the meanwhile the embezzlement exceeded the amount of the bond by something over \$500. This bill seeks to reimburse this postmaster for the amount he was obliged to pay on account of the defalcation of the deputy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I will ask him if the postmaster in question appointed the deputy?

Mr. TOWNSEND. He did not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, I presume the deputy was appointed under civil-service rules, and the postmaster was not in any way personally accountable for his being there?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is my recollection of the matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, if that is the case, undoubtedly the postmaster ought not to suffer. That is one of the bad things about the whole civil-service layout, that instead of giving an official as a confidential subordinate somebody that he trusts you thrust on him a fellow who has passed an examination in geography.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Michigan that when the bill was reached on the calendar

I only asked that it go over because there was no one in the Senate at the time to advise us concerning it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understand that, and that is what I said, that the Senator from Florida heretofore objected to the consideration of the bill because I was not present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay to C. Horatio Scott, postmaster at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., \$596.52 paid to the United States on account of funds embezzled by Frank Higgins, a post-office clerk in the post office at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

COMPENSATION OF INJURED EMPLOYEES.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 15316, to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 15316) to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with an amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there may be some Senators who are interested in this bill and who did not know it would be taken up for consideration this morning. It is for that purpose, and that purpose only, that I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|-----------|
| Bankhead | Groana | Oliver | Taggart |
| Brady | Harding | Overman | Thomas |
| Bryan | Hollis | Penrose | Tillman |
| Chamberlain | Husting | Pomerene | Townsend |
| Chilton | Johnson, S. Dak. | Ransdell | Underwood |
| Clapp | Jones | Shafroth | Vardaman |
| Clark, Wyo. | Kern | Sheppard | Walsh |
| Culberson | Lane | Sherman | Weeks |
| Cummins | Martin, Va. | Smith, Ga. | Williams |
| Curtis | Martine, N. J. | Smith, S. C. | Works |
| Dillingham | Myers | | |
| Fletcher | Nelson | | |
| Gallinger | Norris | | |

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan] on account of sickness in his family. He is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to announce the necessary absence from the city of my colleague [Mr. KENYON]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have been requested to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I beg the indulgence of the Senator for a few minutes while I explain my position on the bill which is the unfinished business and give some of the reasons why I shall vote for it.

It will be remembered that I was one of the Democrats in the Senate who opposed the so-called shipping bill in the last Congress, and I do not hesitate to say if the bill now pending contained the same provisions that were embodied in the shipping bill then considered that I would now oppose it with every means in my power.

It will be remembered that one of the objectionable features, and perhaps the most objectionable in that bill, was found in the authority given the board to purchase vessels, the only limitation being that they should be, in the judgment of the board, suitable for the purposes of the corporation therein provided. The board was left free to buy any and every character of vessel that might be tendered it, including the interned ships belonging to Germany and Austria, caught in our ports when the war broke out. I had no doubt when the bill was pending in the Senate that the purpose of the originators of the project, and the chief purpose, was to purchase these interned vessels, because they could be put under our flag more quickly and in larger numbers than vessels could be constructed or purchased from individual owners.

I believed then, and believe now, that if that bill had become a law and these vessels had been purchased by the United States

and put under our flag, and engaged in commerce between this and foreign countries war would have been the inevitable result, or such strained relations between this Government and the allies as would have absolutely demoralized and destroyed our foreign commerce. If one of these interned ships had been purchased and loaded with a cargo of American products—cotton, if you please, wheat or corn—for one of the neutral ports of Europe, Great Britain or France would have seized the vessel, carried it into port, and confiscated the ship and cargo. We had an experience of this sort with the *Dacia*, which was purchased by private individuals, loaded with cotton and started for a neutral port. The result was she was captured, taken into port, and the matter has been in the prize courts ever since, as I understand. If this had been a Government-owned ship, it would have meant shot and shell, and no diplomacy of ours could have adjusted the matter. The bill then pending did not put any limitation whatever upon the character of the ships to be purchased, nor did it provide from whom or under what regulations ships should be purchased.

In this connection, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to an amendment those of us who oppose the bill offered, and which was promptly voted down. The amendment is as follows:

Provided, That in making purchases of ships during the continuance of the pending European war no purchase shall be made in a way which will disturb the conditions of neutrality.

Under the provisions of the original bill, the board was left to exercise its own sweet will to purchase vessels of any character at any price and turn them over to the corporation therein authorized. We had not then forgotten the scandal, the outrageous scandal, that grew out of the Spanish-American War, when the United States bought indiscriminately vessels at exorbitant prices that were in many instances entirely unsuited for the purposes for which they were supposed to have been purchased. And we had not forgotten that after the war many of these vessels were sold at ridiculously low prices, some of them almost given away, and that others are now tied up at the docks entirely unseaworthy and unfitted for commerce of any kind.

The bill now before the Senate carefully provides against a recurrence of that shameful and disgraceful performance on the part of the authorized agents of the United States. For instance, the bill provides in section 5 that neither the board nor any corporation formed under section 11 in which the United States is then a stockholder shall purchase, lease, or charter any vessel which is then engaged in the foreign or domestic commerce of the United States unless it is about to be withdrawn from such commerce without any intention on the part of the owner to return it thereto within a reasonable time; nor shall the board purchase any vessel under the registry or flag of a foreign country which is then engaged in war; nor can they purchase any ship which is not adapted or can not by reasonable alterations and repairs be adapted to the purposes specified in said section; nor shall they purchase any vessel which, upon expert examination made under the direction of the board, a written report of such examination being filed as a public record, is not without alteration or repair found to be at least 75 per cent as efficient as at the time it was originally put in commission as a seaworthy vessel.

The bill submitted and considered during the last session of Congress provided that vessels purchased or constructed by such shipping board and conveyed to such corporation as therein provided should be entitled to registry under the laws of the United States and should be deemed vessels of the United States and entitled to the benefits and privileges appertaining to such vessels, except that such vessels should engage only in trade with foreign countries or with the Philippine Islands.

The provisions of that bill prevented the vessels so purchased and operated from engaging in coastwise trade. It was contended at that time by those of us who opposed the bill if there was a Shipping Trust in the United States it was that engaged in the coastwise trade. I offered an amendment to that bill providing that these ships might engage in coastwise trade, with a view of breaking up and destroying that coastwise Shipping Trust. The amendment was promptly voted down.

The bill now pending provides that any vessel flying the United States flag may be permitted to engage in the coastwise trade if conditions, commercial and otherwise, require.

The bill considered in the last Congress provided that this shipping board should be composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Navy, and three other persons appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. This was a most objectionable feature, because of the fact that these department heads had no special knowledge of the shipping business, and had not the time to devote to the management of the ships owned and operated by the board, and has been remedied in the pending bill by eliminating the ex officio members and

requiring the President to appoint five commissioners, who shall be appointed with due regard to their fitness to efficiently discharge the duties imposed upon them by the bill and with due regard to a fair representation of the geographical divisions of the country. Not more than three of the commissioners shall be appointed from the same political party.

Another very objectionable feature of the original bill was that it fixed no limit of time as to the operation by the board of the ships built or purchased under the authority granted by that bill. They might have been operated indefinitely. While the bill was under consideration, those of us who opposed it submitted the following amendment, which was rejected:

Provided further, That at the end of two years after the conclusion of peace in Europe the Government shall cease to operate said vessels and shall dispose of them, either by transferring them to the service of the Army or the Navy, or both, so far as they may be adapted to these services, or by leasing or chartering them for private operation.

The only difference in this amendment and the provisions of the pending bill is that a five-year period has been substituted for the suggested two years' limitation of Government ownership and operation after the conclusion of the European war.

Therefore, Mr. President, since the objectionable features of the bill considered in the last Congress have been eliminated, and all the suggestions then made by the opponents of the bill have been incorporated, speaking for myself, I shall unhesitatingly vote for the bill, and I believe I speak for the other Democrats with whom I was associated at that time.

If the concessions now made in this bill had been made in the last Congress, the legislation would have been passed last March instead of during this session, and those of us who supported the motion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] to recommit the bill for the purpose of making the very changes in it that have now been made in the pending bill, submit that our position in this matter has been absolutely and speedily vindicated.

LEGISLATION OF THE SESSION.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. President, I will impose upon the patience of the Senate for a short while to express some views which I hold upon legislation which has been enacted into law this session and upon some legislation still in the making. I will not take up these subjects in the order in which they have come up, but as they present themselves to my mind.

First, I call attention to H. R. 16763, an act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes, intended to raise approximately \$200,000,000. I am heartily in accord with the purpose of the bill, but I do not altogether agree with the manner in which or the principle upon which the taxes are sought to be raised. There are many good features in this bill. I call particular attention to that provision creating a tariff commission. I am in no sense a new convert to the principle of a statutory tariff commission. It has been in the public mind for some years, and it ought to be considered as a thing apart from partisanship.

TARIFF COMMISSION.

For many years I have believed that a tariff commission could be made one of the essential things in the management of our import affairs. The bill provides for a nonpartisan tariff commission composed of six men with full power to investigate relations between the rates of duties on raw and finished products, the effects of various duties and in general the operation of customs laws and their relation to the Federal revenues. It is further empowered to investigate the tariff relations between our country and foreign countries, commercial treaties, preferential provisions, the effect of export bounties and preferential transportation rates, the volume of importations compared with domestic production and consumption, and conditions, causes, and effects relating to competition of foreign industries with those of the United States, including dumping and cost of production.

It would seem, Mr. President, that the time has come when the people wish that the profitless discussion of tariff schedules shall be taken out of politics, if that be possible, and my observation is that when the people make up their minds to do a thing they usually succeed. I can see no possible objection to a nonpartisan tariff commission, aided by trained, experienced specialists and the very best scientists, engaged in gathering data, looking into every detail of the cost of an article at home and abroad, and submitting these facts to Congress. Such data will enable Congress to fix intelligently the proper rates of duty on goods coming to this country from abroad, for the purpose of increasing revenue. The tariff question is the line of cleavage which has divided the two great parties for a century, and knowing the business disturbances which a revision of the tariff always brings about, people have searched in vain for a remedy to take this very troublesome and vexatious question out of politics.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is now handling freight and passenger rates for more than 250,000 miles of steam railways in the United States, and in the main is handling this tremendous problem satisfactorily to the people, on the one side, and the railroad companies on the other.

Mr. President, I believe the establishment of the tariff commission, as outlined in this bill, will be groundwork for the building up of a governmental agency which will eventually occupy to the people of the United States substantially the same position in the fiscal affairs of our Government that the Interstate Commerce Commission occupies in the transportation field to-day. After this commission is established and thoroughly organized, I believe that public opinion in the future will demand that it be given power to fix the maximum rates of duty upon commodities imported into this country much like the Interstate Commerce Commission is now given power to fix rates on railroads. We have already observed the general business disturbance at each recurring presidential election, due to the constant threat of agitation on the tariff, and to avoid this disturbance the business man, the laborer, mechanic, farmer, merchant, physician—in fact, everyone who wishes his country well—earnestly desire to remove this contention from politics and to make it a business question pure and simple.

DYESTUFFS.

Mr. President, I am in favor of that section of the bill relating to dyestuffs. It is one of the necessary things entering into the fabric of life of our manufacture which we have heretofore largely depended upon German manufacturers for our supply. The Germans have almost a monopoly in the manufacture and output of this extremely valuable commodity. The helplessness of this Government was recently demonstrated when our State Department appealed to the allies to permit \$45,000 of this material to come to our country from Germany in order that our Bureau of Printing and Engraving, engaged in printing money and manufacturing postage and internal-revenue stamps, might not be shut down on account of the lack of foreign dyes or forced to adopt different and unstable colors.

We have as good chemists here as Germany or any country in the world. We have as much brain power in our Nation as any nation on earth and men who are as willing to put their money in enterprises as any class of men found anywhere, but as the Germans have almost a monopoly in the manufacture of dyestuffs, backed by all of the wealth of that empire, manufacturers of dyestuffs in this country have felt that they are unwilling to put capital into this business to compete with long-established and prosperous monopoly unless the rates of duty on this commodity be increased. I do not know whether the contention of men engaged in this enterprise in this country is correct or not. I express no opinion upon that, but I take them at their word, and I am willing to cast my vote to increase the rate of duty upon all dyestuffs.

PUBLIC HIGHWAYS.

Mr. President, Congress has passed much legislation this session which will greatly benefit the people, all of which costs money, but I believe the people are willing to stand for taxation where the object sought to be obtained will in the end benefit them. Recently a bill passed both branches of Congress which is now permanent law, for which I voted, authorizing an appropriation of \$85,000,000 to aid the States in the construction of public highways, \$5,000,000 of this amount to be appropriated this year and the amount to be increased each year for the next five years on condition that the individual States contribute for the improvement of their respective highways an amount equal to that allotted to them under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. President, there have been few questions which as a private citizen I have taken greater interest in than that of building and maintaining good roads. The State of Indiana, I am sure, is unquestionably in favor of this great work as a great economic proposition benefiting at once each man, woman, and child. If the people of other States are similarly interested, there is no doubt that this entire appropriation will be made available and that future appropriations of the same nature will be even larger. In commenting upon this subject the Indianapolis News, in an editorial, recently said:

When a farmer has been disappointed in selling his produce he has often been told that transportation constituted an important element in marketing cost. It is more expensive to haul grain or cotton over poor roads from the farm to the railroad than to haul the same shipment a much greater distance by railroad. Therefore everything that the farmer does to improve State roads he does indirectly to increase his profits. Out of a total land area of 22,966,400 acres in Indiana 21,299,823 acres are included in farms. Almost 75 per cent of this farm region is improved. Good roads mean cheap transportation for the produce of the farm.

The average haul of farm produce from place of production to market in this country is 8 miles. It is estimated that it

costs the farmer \$1.25 per ton to haul his produce to market over American roads. In fact, it costs less to ship a bushel of wheat from New York to Liverpool than it does to haul it to the average distance market. It costs the French farmer 21 cents per ton and the German farmer 19 cents per ton for the same haul, both in weight and distance. Why? The reason is found in their improved, almost perfect roads. The article might have gone further and impressed the fact that the cheaper transportation lessens the cost of production because it brings to the producer what he needs for his purposes at the least cost, and would in turn benefit the consumers and if not advance at least sustain and better secure the producers' profit. The question of good roads, not only viewed from the military standpoint, but from a commercial and economic viewpoint and, most of all, in connection with the interests of the farming population, is one that comes home to everyone.

The completion of a perfect system of these great arteries of trade with their feeders reaching to all the farms direct will cause a saving to our farmers of hundreds of millions of dollars annually not only in the diminished wear and tear on their teams and rolling stock but also, as pointed out, in economy of transportation and time.

MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. President, I am also in favor of an ample and aggressive merchant marine. One of the most important features of the shipping bill provides for the control of water rates, but what I have in mind, Mr. President, in connection with this new Government enterprise is the betterment by it of our trade in South America.

SOUTH AMERICAN COUNTRIES.

Some of our Government officials have already visited the South American countries with a view of getting in touch with them, of understanding and learning their ways and manner of doing business, and of learning how to give them an opportunity to become better acquainted with us, as well as our way and manner of doing business. Several of our great banks, recognizing the wonderful possibilities there for development, have lately established branch banks and have thus furnished the means by which the export trade of the United States with those countries can be greatly facilitated. There are now 75,000,000 people living in South America, and in 50 years, it is safe to say, at the prevailing rate of increase there will be over 200,000,000. We ought to have their trade, or at least a lion's share of it. It has been in the hands of European nations. It is within our power to acquire it, if the policy now proposed in our shipping bill, backed up by accommodating banking facilities, is prudently and consistently carried out.

SHIPPING BILL.

The shipping bill in question provides for the use of \$50,000,000 of the Panama Canal bonds for the inauguration of this new departure. In my judgment it is a step in the right direction, a businesslike procedure which should be followed in taking care of expenditures for permanent improvement, and to which the unused residue of those bonds could be profitably applied.

OUR INTERNAL NAVIGATION.

I do not see how we can withhold unqualified assent to the scheme of the improvement of our great rivers, the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Missouri, and their important tributaries, as well as to our important harbors. At the same time, I am opposed to frittering away money on trifling projects which do not serve the general good and are of a purely local character. When we spend large sums for such rivers as the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Ohio, and on our seaport harbors, we cast our bread upon waters which will return to us a thousandfold in the enlargement of our commerce.

FLOOD CONTROL OF RIVERS.

I join in approval of the appropriation for a flood control of the Mississippi, and in this line of work I believe the Government should go forward and prevent the floods of many of the rivers of our country, but in doing it I believe the States or municipalities to be benefited, bordering on these rivers, should pay a fair proportion of the cost. Money expended in this way will do more good, benefit the people more than devoting it to little rivers and creeks on which no appreciable, if any, commerce can be made possible, and which do not serve the general purposes of navigation. In controlling the floods, keeping the water within proper channels, we protect life and property and save the Nation's ultimate resources hundreds of millions of dollars in value by making it possible to place in cultivation a vast acreage now lying idle on account of being subject to recurring overflows and destructive floods.

Mr. President, these are all commendable objects for national enterprise. They command the patriotic support of men of all

classes, for they make for the public welfare. That which helps one may not always help the great masses of the people, but that which benefits the whole can not but be of advantage to the individual. It is not a question, then, of whether or not we shall do all these things but by what means shall we accomplish them? The question is how to go forward with the least possible friction? Who is to bear the temporary and permanent burdens—we of to-day or those of the morrow? Are all the great sums needed for these great undertakings to come from current revenues? Is the weight of taxation to be put all in one spot instead of being distributed over a more equitable area? Are we to raise the money at once, as the revenue bill would seem to suggest, or are we going to let the future generation contribute its share to the permanent protection of the Nation? These are questions that bring us to the consideration of the problem of running the business of the Nation in a businesslike way. Common sense is the essence of good business. Where it rules the best results follow; where it does not prevail business goes on in a lumbering, happy-go-lucky fashion. There are no uncertainties in mathematics. Business is the very spirit and genius of mathematics. As the first absolutely sound business proposition, I declare that current revenues should be used to pay current expenses, and should not be stretched to cover permanent projects of which generations will reap as large, if not larger, benefits than those to-day who initiated and put the projects in motion.

BUSINESS METHODS.

Let us apply ordinary business methods to the affairs of the Government. Under the law the Secretary of the Treasury must submit to Congress at the beginning of each session an estimate of expenditures, and last November he submitted his estimate for the ensuing fiscal year, aggregating \$1,150,783,135.16.

Since these estimates were submitted, at the beginning of this session of Congress, there have been radical changes in conditions determining the expenditures of the Government, and the revenues to be provided to meet them must be viewed from an entirely different angle. It is now estimated for the current year the Government will need nearly \$1,636,765,000.

Mr. President, the increased appropriations this year over last for the Army, Navy, and coast defense and fortifications alone amount to \$352,074,358. Where is this money to come from? Who are to pay the bills? The revenue bill proposes to raise the additional tax, first, by doubling the income and corporation tax; second, by an inheritance tax; third, by a tax on munitions of war; and, under section 302 of the bill, special taxes covering brokers, theaters, amusement and concert halls, circuses, public exhibitions, and so forth. By doubling the income and corporation tax rate it is proposed by the bill to raise an additional \$105,000,000, or \$227,000,000 by income tax. By an inheritance tax it is estimated that it will raise \$15,000,000 the first year. By a tax on munitions of war, \$72,000,000; miscellaneous, which covers special taxes, \$14,000,000. Total taxes proposed to be raised by this bill, about \$200,000,000. The estimated revenue this year under the present law, from the following sources, are: Customs, \$230,000,000; internal revenue, ordinary, \$303,000,000; income and corporation tax, \$125,000,000; emergency tax, \$41,000,000; miscellaneous, \$54,000,000. Total of this year, \$748,200,000.

This is according to the report of the Ways and Means Committee, and would show an estimated excess of disbursements over receipts, which would have to be taken care of, and this excess is necessary to meet military necessities.

PREPAREDNESS.

Mr. President, for many months there has been a demand for preparedness, expressing it as an admitted necessity and as a conviction on the part of the people that the Government must be prepared to meet all emergencies. To do this effectively covers a wide range, and there are so many things entering into the scheme of preparedness for the Government that it is almost impossible to enumerate them all. Complete preparedness is one of the highest conditions in the life of a country. It goes into every detail of the Nation's forces. It surrounds itself with every feature of the people's common interests. In these times we have chosen to apply the word to one special subject, the problem of our Army and Navy and all the other features of our military program.

We ought to give it a much wider application. If Germany had not prepared except so far as her army and navy are concerned, she in no way would have been able to contend against the odds in the present conflict, but the preparedness of Germany was due to an assembling and a utilization of all of the physical, economic, and sentimental forces of the nation, not at any particular period, nor yet with feverish haste at any time, but steadily, systematically, according to well-ordered plans, leaving as little as possible to chance. We may well

afford to pattern after her in thoroughness in the general plan of preparedness in whatever degree we proceed. The whole vast field of industrial and final preparedness is ours to cultivate.

BANKING AND CURRENCY.

We have taken a wonderful step forward by reforming our banking and currency systems. One of the most important and useful needs of the Federal reserve act, in my opinion, is that which makes it possible for our national banks to establish branches in foreign countries. This makes preparedness of the right sort. It strengthens us in South America or wherever lies commercial enterprise, since to gain the future hold or enlarge the field already occupied will be of great advantage for facilitating the expansion of our trade.

Mr. President, for many years there has been a demand coming from the rural people for rural-credits legislation. I believe this was a just demand because this legislation was much needed. This is now an accomplished fact. The law was passed, and the Farm Loan Board selected. Soon all the machinery to put it into operation will be put together and the details of the law will be quickly worked out. Heretofore little, if any, attention has been paid toward extending rural credits. This law marshals the credits of the farmers; it will reduce their rates of interest, and will give a longer time for payments of loans. With lower rates of interest and longer terms of payment as embodied in the bill many thousands of people now unable to own a farm will avail themselves of the opportunity through this bill and become home owners, a thing very much to be desired.

Mr. President, I believe in reasonable preparedness of our country not for the purpose of aggression but solely for the purpose of forestalling aggression. I believe it the part of wisdom to reasonably prepare for war in time of peace, and while we hope that war will never come, we had better adopt the old motto: "You had better be prepared than sorry."

OUR REORGANIZED ARMY.

Mr. President, I voted for the Army reorganization bill, which increased the Regular Army from 100,000 to 178,000 men and which coordinated with it the militia of the various States, aggregating 420,000; but, Mr. President, as there are so many things in that bill which go to real preparedness, the mere increasing of the number of men is, in my judgment, of secondary importance. At little cost it provides for the teaching of military training in all of our high schools and colleges, as well as in our military institutes where not fewer than 100 students are graduated. When this part of the bill gets in full operation and working order we will be turning out each year from 25,000 to 35,000 thoroughly trained young men, so that in the course of a few years we will have a trained Army at a small cost the equal of that of any nation.

A GREATER NAVY.

It is recognized that a navy constitutes the real defense of a nation against foreign attack, and while the naval bill carries a large increase of appropriations over those of previous years, it was a pleasure for me to support it. In our preparedness program the Navy takes first place. Whether our Army or Navy be the largest in number, in men, guns, and ships, I want it to be the best. I want our soldiers to be the best equipped, trained, and drilled, and to be expert in protecting their bodies against disease, which is as deadly as bullets. I want our ships to be of the best possible build, manned with the best guns, of the longest range, to shoot the farthest, and hit the hardest, and do the quickest work, if it has to be done. Mr. President, in my judgment, man for man, gun for gun, and ship for ship, we have the best Navy on earth, and when the present program carried in the naval bill is completed with its fleet of battle cruisers, super-dreadnaughts, submarines, torpedoes, and aeroplanes, we need not fear the outcome of battle with any foe, and we will be in a position to protect American citizens at home and abroad.

OUR IMPROVED COAST DEFENSES.

Mr. President, our preparedness program for our Army and Navy, including coast defense, will cost this year much larger sums of money than last year. For instance, there was appropriated last year to the Army \$101,974,195.87; this year \$267,596,530.10, or an excess of \$165,622,334.23 this year over last. There was appropriated last year for the Navy \$149,661,864.88; this year \$316,726,556.54, or an excess of \$167,064,691.66 this year over last. There was appropriated last year for our coast defense, including fortifications, \$6,006,216.90; this year \$25,742,550, or an excess of \$19,687,333.10 over last year's appropriation. The appropriation this year over last for these three items aggregated \$352,374,373. This demand for preparedness comes from the people, and I believe they are in sympathy with the response to it of their Representatives in Congress.

NITRATE PLANT.

One of the essentials of our preparedness program is that the Government should be supplied with a nitrate plant for the manufacture of explosives. This is one of the fundamental ingredients of explosives. For our supply of this material we are dependent on the nitrates of Chile. In the event of a war with a power having large naval resources our facilities for importing nitrate from Chile might be seriously interfered with. It is necessary, therefore, that we obviate this danger by the establishment of a nitrate plant, for which the many wonderful water powers of this country afford material facilities. The Army reorganization bill makes provision for the establishment of such a plant, the cost and equipment for which \$20,000,000 was authorized to be spent.

It should not be overlooked that when the needs of the Government in this particular are fully served the nitrate plant can and may be utilized for the manufacture of fertilizers to furnish farmers at cost of production. The importance of this provision will be appreciated by anyone who is familiar with the great item of expense to which farmers are put in procuring proper fertilizers. Being furnished by the Government with fertilizer at cost will materially reduce the expense of crops and thus be an incalculable benefit to agriculturists and in turn to the consumer.

WEALTH TO BEAR JUST PROPORTION.

No objection can be made to any plan which causes wealth to bear its just proportion in meeting national expenditures. Wealth should shoulder its responsibility in contributing its fullest share in the general scheme of taxation for the support of the Government. One commendable feature about the present revenue bill is the repeal of some of the stamp taxes. They were very objectionable, and doing away with them is a response on the part of the Congress to make taxes not only as light as possible but the least vexatious.

Mr. President, we are confronted to-day with the serious problem of raising revenue to meet the extraordinary conditions surrounding us in our efforts to put the country in a state of thorough preparedness. There can be no doubt but that the current revenues would have been sufficient to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government. At the close of the fiscal year there was a balance of upward of \$170,000,000 in the Treasury; the largest balance the Treasury has had for many years, showing that the current revenue was sufficient to meet all ordinary demands upon it. But we are not dealing with ordinary, but with extraordinary conditions, with conditions the like of which we have not been called upon to meet in the last half century.

Mr. President, we can all realize what efforts have been put forth by the Ways and Means Committee of the House in trying to reach a satisfactory solution of this extraordinary condition. We also realize the efforts that have been put forth by the Finance Committee of the Senate while passing through the same ordeal of trying to raise the money with the least objection.

What should we do to meet these extraordinary conditions? Along what road should we travel? Are there any well-marked highways which private business of this country has traveled when finding itself confronted with similar conditions? In times of stress or storm private business is often compelled to cope with unusual conditions.

Take our great railroad systems, any one of them may serve to illustrate the point. When one of those great corporations wants to make large increases in its rolling stock, erect extensive buildings, construct new branch lines, tunnel mountains, bridge rivers, reduce grades, straighten its tracks, and finds its current revenue is not sufficient to cover these expenses, does it tax the present stockholders to meet the present extraordinary emergencies? Of course not. To make these improvements at once out of current revenues would hopelessly cripple operations. It has recourse, therefore, to the sensible, thoroughly businesslike expedient of issuing bonds for a term of years, and out of its current income it sets aside every year an amount sufficient to pay the interest on these bonds and to create a sinking fund for their redemption. The same principle is followed by other successful corporations, and, in my judgment, their experience serves as a pattern for handling the affairs of the Government. I thoroughly believe in the soundness of the maxim: "Pay as you go," but I would amend its application to the matter under discussion by saying: "Pay as you go, if you can, but do not pay as you go if it will cripple or hurt you by imposing burdens upon the taxpayers of the present time." The business viewpoint would be not to pay for these great permanent improvements, especially those which relate to the preparedness of our country, out of current revenues.

Instead of increasing income and corporation taxes and other ordinary taxes—in fact, doubling them to an objectionable and

unjust degree, and yet falling short of revenue because of constantly increasing demands—I would suggest that we capitalize the Nation's credit. Issue long-time, low-rate investment bonds, if necessary, of small denominations, and let the future generation bear its share of this preparedness burden.

Follow the example of the most successful business corporations in the country. Obviously the sensible thing to do is to cover these extraordinary expenses caused by our preparedness program by an issue of bonds redeemable in 30 and payable in 50 years, interest at the lowest rate possible, and sinking fund charges to be provided out of current revenues, and the following generations would then bear their share of paying this preparedness indebtedness, which will benefit them as well as ourselves. When the building of the Panama Canal was decided upon Congress authorized a bond issue of \$375,000,000. Of this amount \$134,000,000 has been issued thus far, leaving a balance unissued of \$241,000,000. I understand that \$50,000,000 of these bonds will be issued for the purchase of ships for our new merchant marine if the bill now pending becomes a law, leaving a balance of \$191,000,000 of these bonds unissued. Why not issue the remaining \$191,000,000 of these bonds in order to meet these extraordinary expenditures for preparedness, instead of imposing additional taxes upon the people? You can not constantly keep raising taxes without eventually affecting the farmer, mechanic, laborer, and business man. It seems to me that it is only fair and just that every citizen of the United States be willing to join hands in proportion to his wealth in meeting this extraordinary burden for the purpose of preparedness. This preparedness is for no single class of American citizens, but for all, not only at present, but for future generations, and they should be permitted to join in the expense.

Mr. President, I have not been a Member of this body very long, but it looks to me that sometimes more attention is paid to spending money than to economy. I wonder what would happen to each Senator and to each Member of the House if he spent or appropriated money in his private affairs as he spends it in public affairs? I wonder how long it would be until we would all find ourselves in a court of bankruptcy? On the other hand, I wonder what would happen to the country if every Member of the Senate and House would make up his mind in the direction of rigid economy, and fearlessly cut off every useless dollar of appropriations? I wonder if the taxpayers of the Nation would rise up and revolt against Congress if such a thing should happen? I favor a liberal but businesslike economy.

I believe the taxpayers of the Nation would like to be given a rest from having their taxes increased every year. I am in favor of giving it a tryout just to see what would happen. I do not believe the people can be made prosperous by taxation, be it direct or indirect.

Mr. President, these enormous increases in appropriations can not go on forever. There must and will be a day of reckoning. The power to tax means the power to destroy, and we do not want to destroy the earning power of the people by over-taxation. Congress is getting in the habit of casting about to find things on which to place a tax, instead of vigilantly seeking where it can economize without injury to the public service.

In 1909, when the Payne-Aldrich bill was passed, the Republican Party found itself short of revenue. It imposed a tax on corporations. Four years later, in 1913, when the Democratic Party revised the tariff, it found the Treasury short of revenue and imposed an income tax. And now we are met in this revenue bill with provisions containing all forms of taxation, except the stamp tax, doubling the normal income and corporation tax and adding an inheritance tax and a tax on munitions of war, also taxing simple pleasures, amusements, and so forth.

Mr. President, the party in control holds the purse strings of the Treasury, and it should assume responsibility for disbursements. If it fails to assume this responsibility, it fails to do its duty. Not a dollar can be put into the Treasury unless Congress enacts legislation to raise the money and provides the machinery for collecting it. Not a dollar can be taken out unless Congress appropriates it. Unless more economy is practiced Congress will soon find itself driven to the necessity of laying and collecting taxes on many other things. It may be a stamp tax, a direct tax, but new taxes must and will eventually come unless economy is practiced in the future.

Mr. President, there is much in the budget plan, or some plan which will coordinate and adjust the revenues and expenditures, to commend itself to legislative favor. It seems to me that Congress is commencing at the wrong end. The first thing Congress does is to determine how much money it wants to appropriate, and then it proceeds to make the appropriations, regardless of whether the revenues are sufficient to meet them. Instead

of cutting the appropriations down to meet the revenue, Congress proceeds to increase the rates of taxation and to lay and collect taxes on articles to reach the amounts appropriated.

Mr. President, it seems to me we should begin at the other end and first see whether our revenues are sufficient to meet the ordinary demands. If the revenues are insufficient, then curtail and cut off every useless appropriation. Economy is itself a great revenue. Once Congress embarks on this policy, there would be no necessity under anything like ordinary conditions of laying taxes as suggested in the present revenue bill.

The complaint of the people to-day against the burden of taxation is nation-wide. I do not mean in a partisan sense. Its voice is heard in every township, county, municipality, and State in the Union in regard to local taxation, and I feel sure that if this revenue bill is adopted without some amendment the protest will soon reach Congress.

Mr. President, we should have saved \$20,000,000 in the rivers and harbors bill. There should have been several millions saved in the Agricultural bill, and I have no doubt that on all the other appropriations, outside of the Army and Navy, other millions could have been saved. Mr. President, the fault is not in the administrative officers of the Government. No criticism should be made against them. The responsibility rests with Congress. It is for the administration to estimate the expenditures. It is the duty of Congress to provide them.

Mr. President, to show the extravagant tendency of Congress, bills have been introduced this session for public buildings aggregating \$100,654,000. This represents the aggregate of the amount asked for public buildings, and in a measure makes this a fixed charge upon the Treasury, because these bills, with many more as the country continues to grow, will be enacted into law at some future time, unless Congress defeats such public-buildings bills as are now on the House calendar awaiting action at that end of the Capitol. A public-buildings bill carrying an authorization for \$35,000,000 was recently reported by the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, is now on the House calendar, and I am informed an attempt will be made to pass it through Congress next December.

Mr. President, I recently had an analysis of this bill made by the Architect's Office, which I will insert as a part of my remarks.

Talk about the river and harbor bill being a pork-barrel bill. As compared to the public-buildings bill now on the House calendar there is no comparison whatever, the public-buildings bill being so much worse.

This bill takes care of 297 congressional districts out of a total of 435, and it takes care of every State in the Union except Vermont. Under section 3, I have made a little tabulation. This section carries authorizations for 93 projects. The population in the towns of 39 of these projects ranges from 1,059 to 3,000. The total population in the towns of these 39 projects is 77,579. The average population is 1,980. The total authorization carried for buildings in these 39 projects is \$1,125,000, which means, when made, an average appropriation for each inhabitant of these 39 towns of \$14.50.

Under section 4, "Authorization for sites and buildings," authorizations are made for 104 projects. I have tabulated 39 of these projects having populations ranging from 537 to 3,000, and for these 39 projects \$1,599,000 is authorized.

The total population of these 39 towns is 83,366, an average authorization for each inhabitant of these 39 towns of \$19.05.

Under section 5, "Sites only," I find that authorizations are made for 119 sites. Under this section I have tabulated the cost of 79 sites ranging in population from 628 to 3,000. The towns of these 79 sites have a total population of 168,171. The total authorization for these 79 sites is \$410,000, or an authorization of \$2.43 for each inhabitant of these 79 towns.

It is estimated that a site is about 20 per cent of the cost of the building. At this rate these buildings, when erected, will cost \$2,050,000, or an appropriation of \$12.12 for each citizen living in these 79 towns, or a total of \$14.55 for each resident in the towns.

Mr. President, to some it may appear to be economy to erect public buildings in every little crossroad country town. I select a few of the places where public buildings are to be located and let the facts speak for themselves. For instance, take the following towns:

Eminence, Ky.: Population, 1,274; estimates for the building, \$25,000; the bill authorizes \$30,000.

| | |
|----------------------------------------|------------|
| The interest on the investment is..... | \$1,140.00 |
| Annual depreciation..... | 742.00 |
| Janitor service..... | 960.00 |
| Supplies..... | 900.00 |
| Total cost of upkeep..... | 3,742.00 |

Falmouth, Ky.: Population, 1,180; estimates by architect's office, \$25,000; authorization in bill, \$30,000.

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Interest on investment | \$1,140.00 |
| Annual depreciation | 742.00 |
| Janitor service | 960.00 |
| Supplies | 900.00 |

Total annual upkeep cost..... 3,742.00

Green River, Wyo.: Population, 1,313; architect's estimated cost of building, \$25,000; authorization in bill, \$25,000.

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Interest on investment | \$1,020.00 |
| Annual depreciation | 630.00 |
| Janitor service | 960.00 |
| Supplies | 900.00 |

Total annual upkeep cost..... 3,510.00

Mount Olive, N. C.: Population, 1,071; architect's estimated cost of building, \$35,000; authorization in bill, \$30,000.

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Interest on investment | \$1,140.00 |
| Annual depreciation | 742.50 |
| Janitor service | 960.00 |
| Supplies | 900.00 |

Total annual upkeep cost..... 3,742.50

Roseville, Ga.: Population, 1,059; architect's estimated cost of building, \$30,000; authorization in bill, \$25,000.

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Interest on investment | \$990.00 |
| Annual depreciation | 630.00 |
| Janitor service | 960.00 |
| Supplies | 900.00 |

Total annual upkeep cost..... 3,742.00

Huntingdon, Tenn.: Population, 1,112; authorization in bill, \$25,000.

| | |
|---------------------|----------|
| Interest | \$915.00 |
| Yearly depreciation | 630.00 |
| Janitor service | 960.00 |
| Supplies | 900.00 |

Total annual upkeep cost..... 3,405.00

Clare, Mich.: Population, 1,350; architect's estimated cost of buildings, \$45,000; authorization in bill, \$35,000.

| | |
|---------------------|------------|
| Interest | \$1,140.00 |
| Yearly depreciation | 742.50 |
| Janitor service | 960.00 |
| Supplies | 900.00 |

Total annual upkeep cost..... 3,742.50

Clear Water, Fla.: Population, 1,171; architect's estimated cost of building, \$40,000; authorization in bill, \$40,000.

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Interest on investment | \$1,290.00 |
| Yearly depreciation | 855.00 |
| Janitor service | 960.00 |
| Supplies | 900.00 |

Total annual upkeep cost..... 4,005.00

Hazard, Ky.: Population, 537; architect's estimated cost of building, \$30,000; bill authorization, \$40,000.

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Interest on investment | \$1,290.00 |
| Yearly depreciation | 787.50 |
| Janitor service | 960.00 |
| Supplies | 900.00 |

Total annual upkeep cost..... 3,937.50

Lewisburg, W. Va.: Population, 803; architect's estimated cost of building, \$82,000; bill authorization, \$82,000.

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Interest on investment | \$2,550.00 |
| Yearly depreciation | 755.00 |
| Janitor service | 1,260.00 |
| Supplies | 900.00 |

Total annual upkeep cost..... 5,465.00

Norton, Kans.: Population, 1,787; architect's estimated cost of building, \$40,000; authorized in bill, \$35,000.

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Interest on investment | \$1,140.00 |
| Yearly depreciation | 742.50 |
| Janitor service | 960.00 |
| Supplies | 900.00 |

Total annual upkeep cost..... 3,742.50

Pittsfield, Ill.: Population, 2,095; architect's estimated cost for public building, \$40,000; bill authorized \$35,000.

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Interest on investment | \$1,140.00 |
| Depreciation | 742.50 |
| Janitor service | 960.00 |
| Supplies | 900.00 |

Total annual upkeep cost..... 3,742.50

Mr. President, these are not my figures. These figures were prepared at the architect's office.

Mr. President, a careful study of this public-buildings bill quickly dispels any idea of economy, but it spells extravagance of the worst sort. If this bill succeeds in getting through Con-

gress, the President should come to the rescue of the Treasury and veto it at once.

Mr. President, for the fiscal year 1915, 5,573 men and women paid an income tax in the State of Indiana amounting to \$345,653.92. This year the same number of people must pay an income tax in the State of Indiana of \$691,307.84. Last year 5,018 corporations in Indiana paid corporation taxes amounting to \$644,147.38. This year double the above—\$1,288,294.76—must be paid. Last year Indiana paid into the United States Treasury the following amounts:

For customs, internal revenue, and postal receipts, \$32,517,115.62.

There was expended in the State of Indiana by the Federal Government last year the following:

Customs, internal revenue, public health, public buildings, Postal Service, expenses of United States courts, salaries of Senators and Representatives, \$7,240,838.05.

Which gives a balance to the credit of the State of Indiana of \$25,276,267.57, and the income and corporation tax to be added.

Mr. President, it is unfair, unbusinesslike, to pass items in pork-barrel bills like the river and harbor and public buildings bills at this session or any other session of Congress. To do this those who pay income and other taxes in the State of Indiana and elsewhere must have their tax rates almost doubled; not only increased in life, but their estates, when they exceed \$50,000, must be taxed after death.

Instead of squandering money in catching cattle ticks, killing coyotes, poisoning ground squirrels, doctoring wild ducks, treating goats suffering with Malta fever, sending out useless garden and vegetable seeds, passing pork-barrel river and harbor bills, pork-barrel public-building bills, would it not be better to get down to rigid bedrock economy and cut these useless expenditures off; save the people from the never-ceasing visits of the tax gatherer; or if it be the fixed and determined purpose of Congress to go on yearly increasing these appropriations, would it not be better that we turn these wasted appropriations to things that will improve the country, that will help the people, that will bring them peace, prosperity, and happiness in the future? Instead of pouring money into sinkholes never to return a cent upon the investment, would it not be better that we apply this money to vocational education so that every farmer boy on graduating from high school could have a scientific knowledge of intensive agriculture, or where boys in cities on leaving high school will be first-class mechanics, or the girls have a knowledge of domestic science so as to make them better home builders?

Mr. President, I have only been a member of this body for a short time, but be my stay here long or short, I shall always be found using my best efforts and judgment in curtailment and cutting off what I consider useless or extravagant appropriations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as an appendix to my remarks certain tables and figures in connection with public-building expenditures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

ALABAMA.

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Extensions, remodeling, etc.: Mobile (Gray), first district | \$100,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Greenville (Dent), second district | 30,000 |
| Union Springs (Steagall), third district | 30,000 |
| Sylacauga (Blackmon), fourth district | 30,000 |
| Albertville (Burnett), seventh district | 25,000 |
| Attalla (Burnett), seventh district | 30,000 |
| New sites and buildings: Athens (Almon), eighth district | 35,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Montgomery (Dent), second district | 175,000 |
| Ozark (Steagall), third district | 5,000 |
| Sheffield (Almon), eighth district | 5,000 |

ALASKA.

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Increase in limit of cost: Juneau (Wickersham), delegate | 300,000 |
| Special legislation: Sitka. | |
| Grant lands owned by Government to territory at home for aged. | |

ARIZONA.

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------|
| Increase in limit of cost: Globe (Hayden), at large | 25,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Bisbee (Hayden), at large | 25,000 |
| Flagstaff (Hayden), at large | 7,000 |
| Yuma (Hayden), at large | 6,000 |
| Special legislation: Nogales (Hayden), at large | |

ARKANSAS.

| | |
|------------------------------------------------|---------|
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Forest City (Caraway), first district | 25,000 |
| Brinkley (Oldfield), second district | 25,000 |
| Conway (Jacoway), fifth district | 40,000 |
| Stuttgart (Taylor), sixth district | 30,000 |
| Eldorado (Goodwin), seventh district | 25,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Blytheville (Caraway), first district | 9,000 |
| Van Buren (Wingo), fourth district | 5,000 |
| Little Rock (Jacoway), fifth district | 175,000 |

| CALIFORNIA. | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Extensions, remodeling, etc.: Sacramento (Curry), third district..... | \$50,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| San Francisco (Kahn), fourth district..... | 600,000 |
| Oakland (Elston), sixth district..... | 650,000 |
| Modesto (Church), seventh district..... | 65,000 |
| Long Beach (Randall), ninth district..... | 200,000 |
| San Bernardino (Kettner), eleventh district..... | 70,000 |
| New sites and buildings, Petaluma (Kent), first district..... | 60,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Placerville (Raker), second district..... | 10,000 |
| Susanville (Raker), second district..... | 10,000 |
| San Jose (Hayes), eighth district..... | 15,000 |
| San Mateo (Hayes), eighth district..... | 15,000 |
| Santa Monica (Stephens), tenth district..... | 15,000 |
| Venice (Stephens), tenth district..... | 10,000 |
| Redlands (Kettner), eleventh district..... | 30,000 |
| COLORADO. | |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Sterling (Timberlake), second district..... | 55,000 |
| Canon City (Keating), third district..... | 55,000 |
| Montrose (Taylor), fourth district..... | 150,000 |
| CONNECTICUT. | |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: Manchester (Oakley), first district..... | 40,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Norwalk (Hill), fourth district..... | 140,000 |
| Winsted (Glynn), fifth district..... | 60,000 |
| New sites only: Essex (Freeman), second district..... | 6,000 |
| DELAWARE. | |
| New building on site acquired or authorized: Newark (Miller), at large..... | 30,000 |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. | |
| New sites and buildings: Equipment shop Post Office Department (Clark), second district of Florida..... | 200,000 |
| Special legislation: | |
| Department of Justice (Clark), second district of Florida..... | 3,000,000 |
| Armory, National Guard (Dyer), twelfth district of Missouri..... | 800,000 |
| FLORIDA. | |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Lake City (Clark), second district..... | 35,000 |
| Kissimmee (Sears), fourth district..... | 35,000 |
| New sites and buildings: Clearwater (Sparkman), first district..... | 40,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Arcadia (Sparkman), first district..... | 5,000 |
| Monticello (Clark), second district..... | 5,000 |
| Perry (Clark), second district..... | 5,000 |
| West Palm Beach (Sears), fourth district..... | 10,000 |
| GEORGIA. | |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Waynesboro (Edwards), first district..... | 25,000 |
| Rossville (Lee), seventh district..... | 25,000 |
| Monroe (Tribble), eighth district..... | 30,000 |
| Sandersville (Vinson), tenth district..... | 30,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Blakeley (Park), second district..... | 6,000 |
| Cairo (Park), second district..... | 6,000 |
| Pelham (Park), second district..... | 6,000 |
| Ashburn (Crisp), third district..... | 5,000 |
| Cuthbert (Crisp), third district..... | 6,000 |
| Decatur (Howard), fifth district..... | 8,000 |
| East Point (Howard), fifth district..... | 8,000 |
| Jackson (Wise), sixth district..... | 5,000 |
| Thomaston (Wise), sixth district..... | 5,000 |
| Covington (Tribble), eighth district..... | 5,000 |
| Commerce (Bell), ninth district..... | 5,000 |
| Winder (Bell), ninth district..... | 5,000 |
| Boxley (Walker), eleventh district..... | 5,000 |
| Fort Valley (Hughes), twelfth district..... | 8,000 |
| Hawkinsville (Hughes), twelfth district..... | 8,000 |
| IDAHO. | |
| Increase in limit of cost: Coeur d'Alene (McCracken), at large..... | 88,200 |
| New sites and buildings: Blackfoot (Smith), at large..... | 65,000 |
| ILLINOIS. | |
| Increase in limit of cost: Chicago (Gallagher), eighth district..... | 4,250,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Spring Valley (Stone), sixteenth district..... | 30,000 |
| Carlinville (Wheeler), twenty-first district..... | 30,000 |
| Highland (Rodenberg), twenty-second district..... | 25,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Pittsfield (Wm. Elza Williams), at large..... | 35,000 |
| Harvey (Wilson), third district..... | 55,000 |
| Peru (Fuller), twelfth district..... | 45,000 |
| East Moline (Tavener), fourteenth district..... | 45,000 |
| Galva (King), fifteenth district..... | 45,000 |
| Bloomington (Sterling), seventeenth district..... | 150,000 |
| Effingham (Foster), twenty-third district..... | 45,000 |
| Carbondale (Denison), twenty-fifth district..... | 60,000 |
| Extensions, remodeling, etc.: | |
| Oak Park (McAndrews), sixth district..... | 150,000 |
| Decatur (McKinley), nineteenth district..... | 50,000 |
| New sites only: Lewistown (Chipperfield), at large..... | 5,000 |
| INDIANA. | |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Mt. Vernon (Lieb), first district..... | 40,000 |
| Linton (Cullop), second district..... | 35,000 |
| Greensburg (Dixon), fourth district..... | 45,000 |
| Decatur (Adair), eighth district..... | 45,000 |
| Lebanon (Morrison), ninth district..... | 45,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Hartford City (Rauch), eleventh district..... | \$50,000 |
| Fort Wayne (Cline), twelfth district..... | 550,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Franklin (Dixon), fourth district..... | 10,000 |
| Lawrenceburg (Dixon), fourth district..... | 10,000 |
| IOWA. | |
| Extensions, remodeling, etc.: | |
| Shenandoah (Towner), eighth district..... | 14,000 |
| Sioux City (Steele), eleventh district..... | 335,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Fairfield (Kennedy), first district..... | 50,000 |
| Marengo (Hull), second district..... | 30,000 |
| Oelwein (Haugen), fourth district..... | 40,000 |
| Newton (Ramseyer), sixth district..... | 55,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Eagle Grove (Sweet), third district..... | 25,000 |
| Knoxville (Dowell), seventh district..... | 40,000 |
| Corning (Towner), eighth district..... | 35,000 |
| Harlan (Green), ninth district..... | 35,000 |
| Algona (Woods), tenth district..... | 45,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Mount Pleasant (Kennedy), first district..... | 7,500 |
| Indianola (Dowell), seventh district..... | 5,000 |
| KANSAS. | |
| Extensions, remodeling, etc.: Fort Scott (Taggart), second district..... | 5,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: Holton (Anthony), first district..... | 35,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Olathe (Taggart), second district..... | 55,000 |
| Columbus (Campbell), third district..... | 50,000 |
| Council Grove (Doolittle), fourth district..... | 35,000 |
| Junction City (Helvering), fifth district..... | 55,000 |
| Norton (Connelly), sixth district..... | 35,000 |
| Dodge City (Shouse), seventh district..... | 60,000 |
| Wellington (Ayres), eighth district..... | 15,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Oswego (Campbell), third district..... | 5,000 |
| Wichita (Ayres), eighth district..... | 75,000 |
| KENTUCKY. | |
| Increase in limit of cost: Shelbyville (Helm), eighth district..... | 25,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired: | |
| Murray (Barkley), first district..... | 25,000 |
| Madisonville (Kincheloe), second district..... | 40,000 |
| Central City (Thomas), third district..... | 30,000 |
| Falmouth (Rouse), sixth district..... | 25,000 |
| Eminence (Cantrill), seventh district..... | 40,000 |
| Pikerville (Langley), tenth district..... | 35,000 |
| Barbourville (Powers), eleventh district..... | 25,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Hickman (Barkley), first district..... | 5,000 |
| Russellville (Thomas), third district..... | 10,000 |
| Stanford (Helm), eighth district..... | 5,000 |
| Pineville (Powers), eleventh district..... | 5,000 |
| New sites and buildings: Hazard (Langley), tenth district..... | 40,000 |
| LOUISIANA. | |
| Increase in limit of cost: Alexandria (Aswell), eighth district..... | 30,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: Morgan City (Martin), third district..... | 40,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| New Orleans (Estopinal), first district..... | 500,000 |
| Houma (Martin), third district..... | 50,000 |
| Mansfield (Watkins), fourth district..... | 35,000 |
| Plaquemine (Morgan), sixth district..... | 35,000 |
| De Ridder (Lazaro), seventh district..... | 30,000 |
| New sites only: Winnfield (Aswell), eighth district..... | 5,000 |
| MAINE. | |
| Increase in limit of cost: Bath (McGillicuddy), second district..... | 10,000 |
| Extension, remodeling, etc.: Houlton (Guernsey), fourth district..... | 50,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Sanford (Hinds), first district..... | 50,000 |
| Farmington (McGillicuddy), second district..... | 45,000 |
| MARYLAND. | |
| New sites and buildings: Easton (Price), first district..... | 65,000 |
| Special legislation: | |
| Baltimore (Linthicum), fourth district (make appropriation available for finish and equipment)..... | |
| Hagerstown (Lewis), sixth district (amend legislation to provide new building on present site)..... | 70,000 |
| MASSACHUSETTS. | |
| Increase in limit of cost: Boston (Tague), tenth district..... | 100,000 |
| Extension, remodeling, etc.: | |
| Lowell (Rogers), fifth district..... | 250,000 |
| Boston (Gallivan), twelfth district..... | 250,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Framingham (Carter), thirteenth district..... | 100,000 |
| Provincetown (Walsh), sixteenth district..... | 30,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Great Barrington (Treadway), first district..... | 50,000 |
| Gardner (Paige), third district..... | 90,000 |
| Salem (Gardner), sixth district..... | 130,000 |
| Peabody (Phelan), seventh district..... | 100,000 |
| Wakefield (Dallinger), eighth district..... | 65,000 |
| Everett (Roberts), ninth district..... | 115,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Westboro (Winslow), fourth district..... | 15,000 |
| Whitinsville (Winslow), fourth district..... | 10,000 |
| Boston (Gallivan), twelfth district..... | 1,500,000 |
| Special legislation: Malden (Roberts), ninth district, purchase site and erect building within present building limit. | |

| MICHIGAN. | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Extension, remodeling, etc.: Flint (Kelley), sixth district | \$100,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Benton Harbor (Hamilton), fourth district | 80,000 |
| Bozette City (Scott), eleventh district | 30,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Marshall (Smith), third district | 75,000 |
| St. Johns (Fordney), eighth district | 55,000 |
| Ludington (McLaughlin), ninth district | 75,000 |
| Clare (Loud), tenth district | 35,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Detroit (Doremus), first district | 1,250,000 |
| Eaton Rapids (Smith), third district | 7,500 |
| Alma (Fordney), eighth district | 5,000 |
| MINNESOTA. | |
| Extension, remodeling, etc.: | |
| Albert Lea (Anderson), first district | 50,000 |
| Minneapolis (Smith), fifth district | 100,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: Duluth (Miller), eighth district | 300,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Northfield (Davis), third district | 51,000 |
| Wadena (Lindbergh), sixth district | 35,000 |
| Litchfield (Volstead), seventh district | 35,000 |
| Thief River Falls (Steenerson), ninth district | 55,000 |
| Special legislation: Faribault (Davis), third district, sell portion of site to city. | |
| MISSISSIPPI. | |
| Extension, remodeling, etc.: Jackson (Collier), eighth district | 100,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Indianola (Humphreys), third district | 5,000 |
| Lexington (Humphreys), third district | 5,000 |
| Okolona (Slisson), fourth district | 5,000 |
| Winona (Slisson), fourth district | 7,500 |
| Columbia (Harrison), sixth district | 5,000 |
| Pascagoula (Harrison), sixth district | 5,000 |
| MISSOURI. | |
| Extensions, remodeling, etc.: | |
| Columbia (Shackleford), eighth district | 12,000 |
| Jefferson City (Shackleford), eighth district | 50,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Unionville (Lloyd), first district | 30,000 |
| Trenton (Rucker), second district | 65,000 |
| West Plains (Russell), fourteenth district | 40,000 |
| Aurora (Decker), fifteenth district | 65,000 |
| Mountain Grove (Rube), sixteenth district | 40,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Richmond (Alexander), third district | 40,000 |
| Sedalia (Hamlin), seventh district | 210,000 |
| Bowling Green (Clark), ninth district | 40,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Milan (Rucker), second district | 5,000 |
| Paris (Rucker), second district | 5,000 |
| Sallsbury (Rucker), second district | 5,000 |
| Cameron (Alexander), third district | 5,000 |
| Kansas City (Borland), fifth district | 1,000,000 |
| Eldorado Springs (Dickinson), sixth district | 4,000 |
| Rich Hill (Dickinson), sixth district | 4,000 |
| Perryville (Hensley), thirteenth district | 5,000 |
| Charleston (Russell), fourteenth district | 5,000 |
| Neosho (Decker), fifteenth district | 5,000 |
| MONTANA. | |
| Increase in limit of cost: Missoula (Evans), at large | 35,000 |
| Extension, remodeling, etc.: Butte (Evans), at large | 150,000 |
| New sites and buildings: Lewistown (Stout), at large | 100,000 |
| Special legislation: Bozeman (donation of part of site to city). | |
| NEBRASKA. | |
| New sites and buildings: Superior (Shallenberger), fifth district | 35,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| David City (Sloan), fourth district | 6,000 |
| Seward (Sloan), fourth district | 6,000 |
| Broken Bow (Kinkaid), sixth district | 6,000 |
| O'Neill (Kinkaid), sixth district | 6,000 |
| NEVADA. | |
| New buildings and sites: Elko (Roberts), at large | 59,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Ely (Roberts), at large | 5,000 |
| Las Vegas (Roberts), at large | 5,000 |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE. | |
| Extension, remodeling, etc.: Manchester (Sulloway), first district | 225,000 |
| New sites and buildings: Claremont (Wason), second district | 55,000 |
| NEW JERSEY. | |
| Increase in limit of cost: | |
| Millville (Bacharach), second district | 25,000 |
| Montclair (Leibach), tenth district | 10,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized, Passaic (Drukker), seventh district | 125,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Phillipsburg (Hart), sixth district | 60,000 |
| Weehawken (Egan), eleventh district | 125,000 |
| Special legislation: | |
| Atlantic City (Bacharach), second district (purchase of certain land and improvements) | 60,000 |
| Newark (Leibach), tenth district (post office, courthouse, etc., new site and building, or additional land and enlarge present building) | 600,000 |
| New sites and buildings: Silver City (Hernandez), at large. | 60,000 |

| NEW YORK. | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Increase in limit of cost: | |
| Long Island City (Caldwell), second district | \$100,000 |
| Yonkers (Oglesby), twenty-fourth district | 51,500 |
| Extension, remodeling, etc.: | |
| Albany (Postmaster General), twenty-eighth district | 10,000 |
| Plattsburg (Snell), thirty-first district | 50,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Bronx (Bruckner), twenty-second district | 850,000 |
| Nyack (Husted), twenty-fifth district | 50,000 |
| Oneida (Mott), thirty-second district | 55,000 |
| Binghamton (Fairchild), thirty-fourth district | 500,000 |
| Lyons (Gould), thirty-sixth district | 40,000 |
| Bath (Pratt), thirty-seventh district | 50,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Newburgh (Platt), twenty-sixth district | 140,000 |
| Liberty (Ward), twenty-seventh district | 55,000 |
| Mechanicsville (Parker), twenty-ninth district | 55,000 |
| Canajoharie (Charles), thirtieth district | 60,000 |
| Ticonderoga (Snell), thirty-first district | 35,000 |
| Ilion (Snyder), thirty-third district | 65,000 |
| Dansville (Danforth), thirty-ninth district | 60,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Potsdam (Snell), thirty-first district | 9,000 |
| Lowville (Mott), thirty-second district | 10,000 |
| Albion (Danforth), thirty-ninth district | 10,000 |
| Wellsville (Hamilton), forty-third district | 12,500 |
| Special legislation: Utica, (Snyder), thirty-third district (revised legislation to tear down building). | |
| NORTH CAROLINA. | |
| Increase in limit of cost: | |
| Wilson (Kitchen), second district | 75,000 |
| Wadesboro (Page), seventh district | 5,000 |
| Rockingham (Page), seventh district | 5,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Edenton (Small), first district | 25,000 |
| Mount Olive (Hood), third district | 30,000 |
| Mount Airy (Stedman), fifth district (also increase in limit of cost) | 55,000 |
| Lumberton (Godwin), sixth district | 30,000 |
| Lenoir (Doughton), eighth district | 30,000 |
| New sites and buildings: Morganton (Webb), ninth district | 35,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Williamston (Small), first district | 5,000 |
| Clinton (Hood), third district | 5,000 |
| Louisburg (Pou), fourth district | 6,000 |
| Dunn (Godwin), sixth district | 7,000 |
| Sanford (Page), seventh district | 7,000 |
| Albemarle (Doughton), eighth district | 8,000 |
| Marion (Britt), tenth district | 6,000 |
| NORTH DAKOTA. | |
| Increase in limit of cost: Jamestown (Young), second district | 35,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: Fargo (Helgesen), first district | 250,000 |
| OHIO. | |
| Increase in limit of cost: Steubenville (Hollingsworth), eighteenth district | 125,000 |
| Extension, remodeling, etc.: Findlay (Key), eighth district | 50,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Napoleon (Matthews), fifth district | 35,000 |
| Urbana (Fess), seventh district | 50,000 |
| Niles (Cooper), nineteenth district | 55,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Eaton (Gard), third district | 35,000 |
| Port Clinton (Sherwood), ninth district | 40,000 |
| Circleville (Ricketts), eleventh district | 65,000 |
| Norwalk (Overmeyer), thirteenth district | 65,000 |
| Mount Vernon (Ashbrook), seventeenth district | 70,000 |
| Painesville (Emerson), twenty-second district | 70,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Gallion (Key), eighth district | 15,000 |
| Columbus (Brumbaugh), twelfth district | 240,000 |
| East Palestine (Hollingsworth), eighteenth district | 7,500 |
| OKLAHOMA. | |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Hobart (McClintic), seventh district | 40,000 |
| Alva (Morgan), eighth district | 45,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Vinita (Davenport), first district | 100,000 |
| Hugo (Carter), third district | 58,000 |
| Sapulpa (Murray), fourth district | 70,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Bartlesville (Davenport), first district | 15,000 |
| Norman (Thompson), fifth district | 7,000 |
| Stillwater (Thompson), fifth district | 7,000 |
| Anadarko (Ferris), sixth district | 7,000 |
| Duncan (Ferris), sixth district | 5,000 |
| Waurika (Ferris), sixth district | 5,000 |
| Ponca City (Morgan), eighth district | 7,500 |
| Special legislation: Okmulgee (Hastings), second district (purchase building and remodel same) | 135,000 |
| OREGON. | |
| New buildings on site acquired or authorized: St. Johns (McArthur), third district | 25,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Hood River (Sinnott), second district | 60,000 |
| Oregon City (Hawley), first district | 70,000 |
| New site only: Corvallis (Hawley), first district | 10,000 |
| PENNSYLVANIA. | |
| Increase in limit of cost: | |
| York (Lafean), at large | 25,000 |
| Sunbury (Leshner), sixteenth district | 40,000 |
| Lewistown (Focht), seventeenth district | 20,000 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Extension, remodeling, etc.: | |
| Norristown (Watson), eighth district | \$55,000 |
| Seranton (Farr), tenth district | 100,000 |
| Pottsville (Heaton), twelfth district | 50,000 |
| Williamsport (Kiehn), fifteenth district | 80,000 |
| Beaver Falls (Temple), twenty-fourth district | 58,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Lancaster (Orlest), ninth district | 250,000 |
| Tyrone (Bailey), nineteenth district | 80,000 |
| Kittanning (North), twenty-seventh district | 50,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Lansdowne (Butler), seventh district | 65,000 |
| Nanticoke (Casey), eleventh district | 60,000 |
| Middletown (Kreider), eighteenth district | 65,000 |
| Philipsburg (Rowland), twenty-first district | 60,000 |
| Somerset (Hopwood), twenty-third district | 58,000 |
| Greenville (Miller), twenty-eighth district | 75,000 |
| Duquesne (Barchfeld), thirty-second district | 75,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Philadelphia (Moore), third district | 750,000 |
| Doylestown (Watson), eighth district | 5,000 |
| Plymouth (Casey), eleventh district | 15,000 |
| Lewisburg (Focht), seventeenth district | 10,000 |
| Brookville (North), twenty-first district | 10,000 |
| Midland (Temple), twenty-fourth district | 5,000 |
| Special legislation: | |
| Pittsburgh (Garland), at large (sell lot owned by Government) | |
| Pittsburgh (Garland), at large (Federal building, extension and remodeling) | 50,000 |

PORTO RICO.

Special legislation: San Juan (Clark), second district, Florida (sell warehouse site).

RHODE ISLAND.

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Increase in limit of cost: Narragansett Pier (Stiness), second district | \$10,000 |
| Extension, remodeling, etc.: Providence (O'Shaunnessy), first district | 75,000 |

SOUTH CAROLINA.

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Extension, remodeling, etc.: Aiken (Byrnes), second district | 75,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: Dillon (Ragsdale), sixth district | 25,000 |
| New sites and buildings: Greenwood (Aiken), third district (also sale of present site and building) | 125,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Manning (Whaley), first district | 5,000 |
| Summerville (Whaley), first district | 5,000 |
| Bamberg (Byrnes), second district | 5,000 |
| Easley (Aiken), third district | 5,000 |
| Greer (Nicholls), fourth district | 5,000 |
| York (Finley), fifth district | 9,000 |
| Conway (Ragsdale), sixth district | 3,000 |
| Hartsville (Ragsdale), sixth district | 3,000 |
| Special legislation: Rock Hill (Finley), fifth district (post office, courthouse, etc., new site and building and sell present one or to erect new courthouse on additional land for \$100,000) | 125,000 |

SOUTH DAKOTA.

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| Extension, remodeling, etc.: Aberdeen (Johnson), second district | 60,000 |
| New building on sites acquired or authorized: Vermillion (Dillon), first district | 35,000 |
| New sites only: Canton (Dillon), first district | 6,000 |

TENNESSEE.

| | |
|------------------------------------------------|--------|
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Rogersville (Sells), first district | 25,000 |
| Huntingdon (Sims), eighth district | 25,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Lafollette (Austin), second district | 6,000 |
| Lenoir City (Austin), second district | 6,000 |
| Rockwood (Austin), second district | 6,000 |
| McMinnville (Moon), third district | 5,000 |
| Lewisburg (Houston), fifth district | 5,000 |
| Dickson (Padgett), seventh district | 5,000 |
| Brownsville (Garrett), ninth district | 5,000 |

TEXAS.

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Paris (Black), first district | 170,000 |
| Crockett (Gregg), seventh district | 25,000 |
| Huntsville (Eagle), eighth district | 30,000 |
| Georgetown (Buchanan), tenth district | 30,000 |
| Coleman (Slayden), fourteenth district | 30,000 |
| Sagin (Garner), fifteenth district | 30,000 |
| Sweetwater (Smith), sixteenth district | 35,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Kingsville (McLemore), at large | 40,000 |
| Lufkin (Dies), second district | 35,000 |
| Mexia (Hardy), sixth district | 35,000 |
| Fort Worth (Calloway), twelfth district | 500,000 |
| Plainview (Stephens), thirteenth district | 45,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| San Benito (Davis), at large | 6,000 |
| Henderson (Young), third district | 5,000 |
| Alvin (Burgess), ninth district | 6,000 |
| Lockhart (Buchanan), tenth district | 6,000 |
| Special legislation: | |
| Dallas (Summers), fifth district (sub-post office and site) | 550,000 |
| Dallas (Summers), fifth district (courthouse and other branches) | 1,250,000 |

UTAH.

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| Increase in limit of cost: Park City (Howell), first district | 10,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: Nephi (Howell), first district | 25,000 |

VIRGINIA.

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Extensions, remodeling, etc.: | |
| Norfolk (Holland), second district | \$650,000 |
| Roanoke (Glass), sixth district | 75,000 |
| Harrisonburg (Hay), seventh district | 60,000 |
| Alexandria (Carlin), eighth district | 75,000 |
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: West Point (Montague), third district | |
| 25,000 | |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Bristol (Slemp), ninth district | 80,000 |
| Staunton (Flood), tenth district | 85,000 |

WASHINGTON.

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Hoquiam (Johnson), third district | 75,000 |
| Seattle (Humphrey), first district | 275,000 |
| Special legislation: McNeil Island (Johnson), third district (penitentiary, additional land) | |
| 10,000 | |

WEST VIRGINIA.

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: New Martinsville (Neely), first district | |
| 40,000 | |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Keyser (Bowers), second district | 55,000 |
| Lewisburg (Littlepage), third district | 82,000 |
| Princeton (Cooper), fifth district | 45,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Beckley (Sutherland), at large | 10,000 |
| Mannington (Neely), first district | 10,000 |
| Berkeley Spring (Sowers), second district | 10,000 |

WISCONSIN.

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Increase in limit of cost: Milwaukee (Cary), fourth district | 100,000 |
| Extensions, remodeling, etc.: | |
| Kenosha (Cooper), first district | 75,000 |
| Appleton (Konop), ninth district | 50,000 |
| New sites and buildings: | |
| Portage (Burke), second district | 57,000 |
| Reedsburg (Esch), seventh district | 40,000 |
| Grand Rapids (Browne), eighth district | 70,000 |
| Sturgeon Bay (Konop), ninth district | 40,000 |
| Ladysmith (Lenroot), eleventh district | 35,000 |
| New sites only: | |
| Menasha (Reilly), sixth district | 10,000 |
| Two Rivers (Reilly), sixth district | 10,000 |

WYOMING.

| | |
|------------------------------------------------|--------|
| New buildings on sites acquired or authorized: | |
| Green River (Mondell), at large | 25,000 |
| Newcastle (Mondell), at large | 25,000 |

PUBLIC BUILDINGS BILL.

Analysis of sections 3, 4, and 5 of public buildings bill of places where postal receipts are less than \$15,000.

NOTE.—Explanation of analysis of sections 3, 4, and 5 of public buildings bill of places where postal receipts are less than \$15,000: "Place" indicates location of proposed building. "Estimate" is the amount that the department estimated would be the cost of the project at the place named. "Bill" is the amount provided in the omnibus bill for the place indicated. "Interest" is the estimated interest on the amount named in said omnibus bill with furnishing added. "Depreciation" is the estimated annual depreciation on this same amount less amount paid for site. "Janitor" and "Supplies" are, respectively, estimated annual cost for janitor service and supplies in each instance. "Total" is the sum of the four previous columns, namely, "Interest," "Depreciation," "Janitor," and "Supplies."

| Place. | Estimate. | Bill. | Interest. | Depreciation. | Janitor. | Supplies. | Total. |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|---------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| BUILDINGS ON SITES OWNED OR AUTHORIZED. | | | | | | | |
| Albertville, Ala. | \$30,000 | \$25,000 | \$990.00 | \$630.00 | \$960 | \$900 | \$3,480.00 |
| Attala, Ala. | 25,000 | 30,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.00 | 960 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Barbourville, Ky. | 25,000 | 25,000 | 990.00 | 630.00 | 960 | 900 | 3,480.00 |
| Brinkley, Ark. | 25,000 | 25,000 | 990.00 | 630.00 | 960 | 900 | 3,480.00 |
| Boone City, Mich. | 35,000 | 30,000 | 1,230.00 | 742.50 | 960 | 900 | 3,832.50 |
| Carlinville, Ill. | 45,000 | 30,000 | 1,290.00 | 742.50 | 960 | 900 | 3,832.50 |
| Central City, Ky. | 30,000 | 30,000 | 1,215.00 | 742.50 | 960 | 900 | 3,817.50 |
| Coleman, Tex. | 50,000 | 30,000 | 900.00 | 742.50 | 960 | 900 | 3,502.50 |
| Conway, Ark. | 55,000 | 40,000 | 1,350.00 | 967.50 | 1,260 | 900 | 4,477.50 |
| Crockett, Tex. | 45,000 | 25,000 | 1,020.00 | 630.00 | 960 | 900 | 3,510.00 |
| Dillon, S. C. | 30,000 | 25,000 | 1,065.00 | 630.00 | 960 | 900 | 3,555.00 |
| Edenton, N. C. | 35,000 | 45,000 | 1,665.00 | 1,090.25 | 960 | 900 | 4,616.25 |
| Eldorado, Ark. | 25,000 | 25,000 | 990.00 | 630.00 | 960 | 900 | 3,480.00 |
| Eminence, Ky. | 30,000 | 40,000 | 1,495.50 | 967.50 | 960 | 900 | 4,323.00 |
| Falmouth, Ky. | 25,000 | 30,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 960 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Forest City, Ark. | 55,000 | 25,000 | 990.00 | 630.00 | 960 | 900 | 3,480.00 |
| Georgetown, Tex. | 45,000 | 30,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 960 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Green River, Wyo. | 25,000 | 25,000 | 1,020.00 | 630.00 | 960 | 900 | 3,510.00 |
| Greenville, Ala. | 35,000 | 30,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 960 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Highland, Ill. | 30,000 | 25,000 | 960.00 | 630.00 | 960 | 900 | 3,450.00 |
| Holton, Kans. | 35,000 | 35,000 | 1,275.00 | 855.00 | 960 | 900 | 3,990.00 |
| Huntington, Tenn. | 25,000 | 25,000 | 915.00 | 630.00 | 960 | 900 | 3,405.00 |
| Huntsville, Tex. | 55,000 | 30,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 960 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Kissimmee, Fla. | 35,000 | 35,000 | 1,290.00 | 855.00 | 960 | 900 | 4,035.00 |
| Lake City, Fla. | 50,000 | 35,000 | 1,320.00 | 855.00 | 960 | 900 | 4,035.00 |
| Lenoir, N. C. | 55,000 | 30,000 | 1,125.00 | 742.50 | 960 | 900 | 3,727.50 |
| Linton, Ind. | 45,000 | 35,000 | 1,380.00 | 855.00 | 960 | 900 | 4,035.00 |
| Lumberton, N. C. | 45,000 | 30,000 | 1,290.00 | 742.50 | 960 | 900 | 3,832.50 |
| Madisonville, Ky. | 50,000 | 40,000 | 1,590.00 | 967.50 | 1,260 | 900 | 4,717.50 |
| Manchester, Conn. | 45,000 | 40,000 | 1,650.00 | 967.50 | 1,260 | 900 | 4,777.50 |
| Marengo, Iowa | 30,000 | 30,000 | 1,095.00 | 742.50 | 960 | 900 | 3,697.50 |
| Monroe, Ga. | 45,000 | 30,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 960 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Mount Airy, N. C. | 55,000 | 55,000 | 1,890.00 | 1,305.00 | 1,260 | 900 | 5,355.00 |
| Morgan City, La. | 30,000 | 40,000 | 1,470.00 | 967.50 | 1,260 | 900 | 4,597.50 |
| Mountain Grove, Mo. | 45,000 | 40,000 | 1,515.00 | 967.50 | 1,260 | 900 | 4,642.50 |
| Mount Olive, N. C. | 35,000 | 30,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 960 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Mount Vernon, Ind. | 55,000 | 40,000 | 1,515.00 | 967.50 | 1,260 | 900 | 4,642.50 |
| Murray, Ky. | 25,000 | 25,000 | 990.00 | 630.00 | 960 | 900 | 3,480.00 |

| Place. | Estimate. | Bill. | Interest. | Depreciation. | Janitor. | Supplies. | Total. |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|---------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| BUILDINGS ON SITES OWNED OR AUTHORIZED—contd. | | | | | | | |
| Napoleon, Ohio..... | \$50,000 | \$35,000 | \$1,365.00 | \$855.00 | \$900 | \$900 | \$4,080.00 |
| Nephi, Utah..... | 30,000 | 25,000 | 990.00 | 630.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,480.00 |
| Newark, Del..... | 30,000 | 30,000 | 1,110.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,712.50 |
| Newcastle, Wyo..... | 25,000 | 25,000 | 990.00 | 630.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,480.00 |
| New Martinsville, W. Va..... | 50,000 | 40,000 | 1,665.00 | 957.50 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,782.50 |
| Pikeville, Ky..... | 25,000 | 30,000 | 1,000.00 | 630.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,555.00 |
| Provincetown, Mass..... | 55,000 | 30,000 | 1,230.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,832.50 |
| Rogersville, Tenn..... | 25,000 | 25,000 | 930.00 | 630.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,420.00 |
| Rossville, Ga..... | 30,000 | 25,000 | 990.00 | 630.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,480.00 |
| Sandersville, Ga..... | 55,000 | 30,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Seguin, Tex..... | 45,000 | 30,000 | 990.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,592.50 |
| Spring Valley, Ill..... | 35,000 | 30,000 | 1,290.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,892.50 |
| St. Johns, Oreg..... | 25,000 | 25,000 | 990.00 | 630.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,480.00 |
| Stuttgart, Ark..... | 50,000 | 30,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Sylacauga, Ala..... | 25,000 | 30,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Union Springs, Ala..... | 45,000 | 25,000 | 975.00 | 630.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,465.00 |
| Unionville, Mo..... | 35,000 | 30,000 | 1,215.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,817.50 |
| Vermilion, S. Dak..... | 45,000 | 35,000 | 1,365.00 | 855.00 | 900 | 900 | 4,080.00 |
| West Plains, Mo..... | 35,000 | 40,000 | 1,440.00 | 967.50 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,567.50 |
| Westpoint, Va..... | 25,000 | 25,000 | 900.00 | 630.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,390.00 |
| Waynesboro, Ga..... | 50,000 | 25,000 | 962.00 | 630.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,452.00 |
| | 2,070,000 | 1,840,000 | 70,332.50 | 45,168.75 | 59,340 | 53,100 | 228,241.25 |
| SITES AND BUILDINGS (4). | | | | | | | |
| Athens, Ala..... | 50,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Bowling Green, Mo..... | 45,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Clare, Mich..... | 40,000 | 40,000 | 1,230.00 | 855.00 | 900 | 900 | 4,005.00 |
| Clearwater, Fla..... | 50,000 | 50,000 | 1,590.00 | 1,080.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,830.00 |
| Columbus, Kans..... | 52,500 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Council Grove, Kans..... | 30,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Duquesne, Pa..... | 55,000 | 75,000 | 2,340.00 | 1,417.50 | 1,200 | 900 | 5,917.50 |
| Eagle Grove, Iowa..... | 55,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| East Moline, Ill..... | 65,000 | 45,000 | 1,440.00 | 855.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,455.00 |
| Eaton, Ohio..... | 35,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Effingham, Ill..... | 60,000 | 45,000 | 1,440.00 | 855.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,455.00 |
| Farlington, Me..... | 55,000 | 45,000 | 1,440.00 | 855.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,455.00 |
| Harlan, Iowa..... | 52,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 697.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,697.50 |
| Hazard, Ky..... | 30,000 | 40,000 | 1,230.00 | 787.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,937.50 |
| Hood River, Oreg..... | 65,000 | 60,000 | 1,090.00 | 1,192.50 | 1,200 | 900 | 5,242.50 |
| Houma, La..... | 60,000 | 50,000 | 1,590.00 | 967.50 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,717.50 |
| Keyser, W. Va..... | 55,000 | 55,000 | 1,740.00 | 1,080.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,980.00 |
| Kingsville, Tex..... | 55,000 | 40,000 | 1,290.00 | 855.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,305.00 |
| Knoxville, Iowa..... | 55,000 | 40,000 | 1,290.00 | 855.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,305.00 |
| Ladysmith, Wis..... | 52,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 697.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,697.50 |
| Lewisburg, W. Va..... | 82,000 | 62,000 | 2,550.00 | 1,755.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 6,465.00 |
| Litchfield, Minn..... | 50,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Lufkin, Tex..... | 55,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 630.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,630.00 |
| Mansfield, La..... | 40,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Middletown, Pa..... | 60,000 | 65,000 | 2,040.00 | 1,192.50 | 900 | 900 | 5,092.50 |
| Mexia, Tex..... | 51,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 720.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,720.00 |
| Morgantown, N. C..... | 61,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 720.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,720.00 |
| Nanticoke, Pa..... | 65,000 | 60,000 | 1,890.00 | 967.50 | 900 | 900 | 4,717.50 |
| Norton, Kans..... | 40,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Pittsfield, Ill..... | 40,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Plaquemine, La..... | 35,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Port Clinton, Ohio..... | 51,000 | 40,000 | 1,290.00 | 832.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,982.50 |
| Princeton, W. Va..... | 55,000 | 45,000 | 1,440.00 | 855.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,455.00 |
| Reedsburg, Wis..... | 55,000 | 40,000 | 1,290.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,892.50 |
| Richmond, Mo..... | 55,000 | 40,000 | 1,290.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,892.50 |
| Sanford, Me..... | 56,000 | 50,000 | 1,590.00 | 945.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,095.00 |
| Sturgeon Bay, Wis..... | 50,000 | 40,000 | 1,290.00 | 855.00 | 900 | 900 | 4,005.00 |
| Superior, Neb..... | 40,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Ticonderoga, N. Y..... | 35,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Wadena, Minn..... | 35,000 | 35,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| | 1,962,500 | 1,747,000 | 56,100.00 | 35,145.00 | 43,200 | 36,900 | 171,405.50 |
| SITES (5). | | | | | | | |
| Allamare, N. C..... | 10,000 | 6,000 | 1,620.00 | 1,080.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,860.00 |
| Alma, Mich..... | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Alvin, Tex..... | 5,000 | 6,000 | 1,320.00 | 855.00 | 900 | 900 | 4,035.00 |
| Anadarko, Okla..... | 5,000 | 7,000 | 1,500.00 | 967.50 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,627.50 |
| Arcadia, Fla..... | 5,000 | 5,000 | 1,740.00 | 1,192.50 | 1,200 | 900 | 5,092.50 |
| Ashburn, Ga..... | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Bamberg, S. C..... | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Baxley, Ga..... | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Beckley, W. Va..... | 10,000 | 10,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Berkley Spgs, W. Va..... | 5,000 | 10,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Blackley, Ga..... | 5,000 | 6,000 | 1,470.00 | 967.50 | 900 | 900 | 4,297.50 |
| Blytheville, Ark..... | 10,000 | 9,000 | 1,860.00 | 1,192.50 | 1,200 | 900 | 5,212.50 |
| Broken Bow, Neb..... | 10,000 | 6,000 | 1,920.00 | 1,305.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 5,355.00 |
| Brookville, Pa..... | 10,000 | 10,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Brownsville, Tenn..... | 5,000 | 5,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,012.50 |
| Cairo, Ga..... | 5,000 | 6,000 | 1,620.00 | 1,080.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,860.00 |
| Cameron, Mo..... | 5,000 | 5,000 | 1,890.00 | 1,305.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 5,355.00 |
| Canton, S. Dak..... | 5,000 | 6,000 | 1,620.00 | 1,080.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,860.00 |
| Charleston, Mo..... | 5,000 | 6,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Clinton, N. C..... | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Columbia, Miss..... | 6,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Commerce, Ga..... | 5,000 | 5,000 | 990.00 | 630.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,480.00 |
| Conway, S. C..... | 5,000 | 3,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Covington, Ga..... | 5,000 | 5,000 | 1,290.00 | 855.00 | 900 | 900 | 4,005.00 |
| Cuthbert, Ga..... | 5,000 | 6,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| David City, Neb..... | 5,000 | 6,000 | 1,340.00 | 855.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,355.00 |
| Decatur, Ga..... | 8,000 | 8,000 | 1,530.00 | 967.50 | 900 | 900 | 4,357.50 |
| Dickson, Tenn..... | 5,000 | 5,000 | 1,440.00 | 967.50 | 900 | 900 | 4,267.50 |
| Duncan, Okla..... | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |

¹ No estimate made.

| Place. | Estimate. | Bill. | Interest. | Depreciation. | Janitor. | Supplies. | Total. |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------|------------|---------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| SITES (5)—cont'd. | | | | | | | |
| Dunn, N. C. | \$8,000 | \$7,000 | \$1,500.00 | \$967.50 | \$900 | \$900 | \$4,327.50 |
| Easley, S. C. | | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| East Palestine, Ohio | 10,000 | 7,500 | 1,680.00 | 1,080.00 | 600 | 900 | 4,320.00 |
| East Point, Ga. | 10,000 | 8,000 | 1,680.00 | 1,080.00 | 900 | 900 | 4,620.00 |
| Eaton Rapids, Mich. | | 7,500 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Eldorado Springs, Mo. | | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Ely, Nev. | | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Essex, Conn. | 10,000 | 6,000 | 1,020.00 | 630.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,510.00 |
| Franklin, Ind. | | 10,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Greer, S. C. | | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Hartsville, S. C. | 5,000 | 3,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Hawkinsville, Ga. | 10,000 | 8,000 | 1,680.00 | 1,080.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,920.00 |
| Henderson, Tex. | 5,000 | 5,000 | 990.00 | 630.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,480.00 |
| Hickman, Ky. | 5,000 | 5,000 | 1,590.00 | 1,080.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,830.00 |
| Indianola, Iowa. | 5,000 | 5,000 | 1,440.00 | 1,080.00 | 900 | 900 | 4,380.00 |
| Jackson, Ga. | 5,000 | 5,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| La Follette, Tenn. | | 6,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Las Vegas, Nev. | | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Lawrenceburg, Ind. | 5,000 | 10,000 | 1,290.00 | 855.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,305.00 |
| Lenoir City, Tenn. | | 6,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Lewisburg, Tenn. | 5,000 | 5,000 | 1,740.00 | 1,192.50 | 1,200 | 900 | 5,092.50 |
| Lewiston, Ill. | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Lexington, Miss. | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Lockhart, Tex. | (1) | 6,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Louisburg, N. C. | 10,000 | 6,000 | 1,890.00 | 1,192.50 | 1,200 | 900 | 5,242.50 |
| Lowville, N. Y. | 10,000 | 10,000 | 1,740.00 | 1,080.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,980.00 |
| Manning, S. C. | (1) | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Mannington, W. Va. | (1) | 10,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Marion, N. C. | 5,000 | 6,000 | 1,740.00 | 1,192.50 | 1,200 | 900 | 5,092.50 |
| McMinnville, Tenn. | 5,000 | 5,000 | 1,590.00 | 1,080.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,830.00 |
| Midland, Pa. | 8,500 | 5,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Millan, Mo. | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Monticello, Fla. | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Ocala, Miss. | (1) | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| O'Neill, Nebr. | 10,000 | 6,000 | 1,020.00 | 630.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,510.00 |
| Paris, Mo. | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Pascagoula, Miss. | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Pelham, Ga. | 5,000 | 6,000 | 1,020.00 | 630.00 | 900 | 900 | 3,510.00 |
| Perry, Fla. | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Perryville, Mo. | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Pineville, Ky. | 6,000 | 5,000 | 1,290.00 | 855.00 | 900 | 900 | 4,005.00 |
| Placerville, Cal. | 7,000 | 10,000 | 1,950.00 | 1,305.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 5,415.00 |
| Plymouth, Pa. | 23,000 | 15,000 | 1,740.00 | 967.50 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,867.50 |
| Ponca City, Okla. | 5,000 | 7,500 | 1,665.00 | 1,080.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,905.00 |
| Rich Hill, Mo. | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Rockwood, Tenn. | | 6,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Russellville, Ky. | | 10,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Salisbury, Mo. | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| San Bonito, Tex. | 5,000 | 6,000 | 1,470.00 | 967.50 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,597.50 |
| Sanford, N. C. | 5,000 | 7,000 | 1,650.00 | 1,080.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,880.00 |
| Seward, Nebr. | 5,000 | 6,000 | 1,320.00 | 855.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,335.00 |
| Sheffield, Ala. | | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Stanford, Ky. | | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Sumnerville, S. C. | 5,000 | 5,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Susanyville, Cal. | 5,000 | 10,000 | 1,740.00 | 1,080.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,980.00 |
| Van Buren, Ark. | 5,000 | 6,000 | 1,620.00 | 1,080.00 | 1,200 | 900 | 4,880.00 |
| Venice, Cal. | 10,000 | 10,000 | 1,890.00 | 1,192.50 | 1,200 | 900 | 5,242.50 |
| Waurika, Okla. | 7,000 | 5,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Williamston, N. C. | 5,000 | 5,000 | 1,140.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,742.50 |
| Winder, Ga. | 5,000 | 5,000 | 1,590.00 | 1,080.00 | 900 | 900 | 4,530.00 |
| Winfield, La. | 5,000 | 5,000 | 1,440.00 | 967.50 | 900 | 900 | 4,267.50 |
| Winona, Miss. | 5,000 | 7,500 | 1,215.00 | 742.50 | 900 | 900 | 3,817.50 |
| York, S. C. | 5,000 | 9,000 | 1,410.00 | 855.00 | 900 | 900 | 4,125.00 |
| Yuma, Ariz. | | 6,000 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| | 434,500 | 581,000 | 75,590.00 | 49,342.50 | 56,760 | 45,900 | 292,592.50 |

Mr. SMOOT. I have not the least desire to delay its passage.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator's remarks would be appropriate under the shipping bill, which comes up at 12 o'clock, and I thought we would do well to take a vote on the workmen's compensation bill and get rid of it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the President's demand for a tariff commission, the result of a sudden change of mind, his party has found difficult to understand. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee stated in the House that the party, of which he is the leader in that body, until about two months before he brought in the remarkable revenue bill, was opposed to a tariff commission. But in this matter, as in many others, it promptly changed its mind on demand of the President. There was no call for reasons and no serious consideration given to the change, it being sufficient that the President asked for it. In his canvass in 1912 the President said: "I will not have any commissions playing Providence to me."

Mr. GALLINGER. "Playing what," I will ask the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. "Playing Providence to me."

Mr. GALLINGER. What did the President mean by that expression?

Mr. SMOOT. I should very much prefer to have the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] explain what the President meant, because he has taken upon himself the responsibility of explaining the real meaning of statements made by the President and what was in the President's mind when making them.

Not long ago, in his Indianapolis speech, the President said that the establishment of a tariff commission was unnecessary, as the power had already been given to the Federal Trade Commission. The President said that in framing the Trade Commission law they had "slipped one over" on the Republicans in securing such power for the commission. That statement was not correct, as the Republicans had not been deceived in the least in the matter; but while the President opposed such a commission and was in accord with his party in forcing out of existence the bipartisan commission that was in office at the time he was elected, he now asks for a commission.

The Democratic Party has always opposed a tariff commission. The one appointed by President Taft was indirectly authorized by the tariff law then in existence, as the Democrats prevented the passage of a bill to create such a commission. A tariff board, the Democrats held, was a useless expense, and such a conclusion was the only consistent one to accord with their theory of a tariff for revenue only. Their platform denounced a protective tariff as unconstitutional, and if the only object in framing a tariff law is to secure revenue there is no necessity for any information from a tariff board. The present Speaker of the House of Representatives stated that "such a thing as a nonpartisan board is an impossibility in nature," and he declared that a tariff board was useless. Another leading Democrat in the House declared that the bill to create a tariff commission "violates a well-established and venerated principle in the doctrine of the Democratic Party."

Another leading Democrat asked, "Why do men who believe in a tariff for revenue only want to know what it costs to make or not to make foreign goods that come in competition with our own?" The Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, stated that he was "not in favor of a tariff commission and never had been," and added, "I am thoroughly opposed to a tariff commission in any form whatever." The present Governor of the Philippines, a former Member of the House, declared his belief that the tariff commission was "a useless expenditure of public money," adding, "I do not see any place in the framing of a Democratic tariff bill for revenue only for an inquiry into the difference of cost between production here and abroad. The purpose of such a commission bill is to harass and delay." The present chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House declared that he had never known a Democratic district convention, a Democratic State convention, or a Democratic national convention to declare in favor of a tariff board or tariff commission of any kind. That was true enough until the last Democratic national convention adopted a plank, written by the President, in favor of this proposed commission. The junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] said: "For one, I stand on the traditional ground of opposition to these commissions; of opposition to legislation encroaching on the constitutional functions of Congress." A Representative from Alabama, an associate of the junior Senator from that State, declared that a tariff board was a "make-shift, and a false pretense." A leading Democratic Representative from Indiana [Mr. COX] declared that the tariff board was "wrong in principle and wrong in policy."

A prominent Democrat from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] declared that a tariff board "would be a surrender of the dearest of Democratic principles." The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] said: "I have always been against boards and commissions. I believe that the fathers of the Republic were wise, even wiser than they knew, when they lodged with the great House of Representatives of the people the right to formulate tariff legislation." Another eminent Democrat quoted the well-known lines:

The Devil was sick—the Devil a monk would be.
The Devil was well—the devil a monk was he.

From which it would appear that that Member, now chairman of the Committee on Printing, thinks that the President is a pretty sick man politically, which is no doubt the case.

Mr. President, I shall not take any further time of the Senate at this time; but I have similar quotations that would fill a volume, from leading Democrats of the Senate and of the House and of the country, bitterly opposing the creation of a tariff commission. We find now that all of them will vote for such a commission; all have changed their minds; all fall in line at the command of the captain of the team and march like good soldiers, and they will vote for the creation of a tariff commission, no matter what the character of it may be.

Mr. President, I think that when the revenue bill is before the Senate it will be the proper time to go into the fuller discussion of this subject. I have been in favor of a tariff commission for years, but not one such as proposed. Whatever tariff commission is created ought to be responsive to Congress, report to Congress, its membership be appointed by Congress, and not be in any way under obligation to the President of the United States. If such a tariff commission could be created, or one patterned after the ones in Germany, there would be no harm in having a tariff commission, and would be a source from which information could be secured by the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives at times when they are considering a change in the revenue laws of our country.

Mr. WEEKS obtained the floor.

COMPENSATION OF INJURED EMPLOYEES.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, we have before the Senate the United States employees' compensation bill. Does the Senator from Massachusetts wish to address himself to the bill?

Mr. WEEKS. I desire to take the floor when the Senator from Georgia has finished.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think we desire any special discussion of the United States employees' compensation bill. There are two amendments. I am advised that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] desires to offer an amendment, and for that reason Senators on the other side prefer that we should not vote upon the bill at once.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15455) to establish a United States shipping board for the purpose of encouraging, developing, and creating a naval auxiliary and naval reserve and a merchant marine to meet the requirements of the commerce of the United States with its Territories and possessions and with foreign countries; to regulate carriers by water engaged in the foreign and interstate commerce of the United States; and for other purposes.

[Mr. WEEKS addressed the Senate. After speaking for an hour and three-quarters, he yielded the floor for the day. His speech is printed entire in the Senate proceedings of August 14, 1916.]

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that circumstances make it necessary for me to leave the city to-night. If it were not for that fact I should not at this time attempt to speak upon this bill. In fact, I know that this caucus-made measure will be passed, against all protest and reason, and nothing I can or could say will change the opinion of Senators, because that has already been irrevocably settled. I, however, desire briefly to state why I am opposed to the bill, and why I would vote against it if I were present when it is placed on its passage.

After reading the bill and listening to the arguments that have been made upon it—in fact, being familiar, as all of us are, with all the conditions which caused its conception and birth—I have concluded that it is here for campaign purposes only.

I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] that there are very few Senators who believe that the bill can be worked satisfactorily, and who do not believe that it will

probably be repealed before it has had time to go into full operation. I believe it will be repealed if the next Congress should be Republican.

Knowing the record of the President of the United States on the Panama Canal tolls proposition, it is entirely reasonable to believe that he would reverse himself in two years from now if, unfortunately for the country, he should be reelected, and ask his party—nay, compel his party—to reverse the action that it is about to take on this measure. The greatest cause for doubt of his doing this, however, is the fact that he was wrong when he forced his party to repeal the Panama act, and he would be right if he asked for a repeal of the bill about to be enacted into law.

This will make a fairly good campaign document for Democratic Senators, who do not stop to explain to the people the futility of the measure. They can give it an oratorical virtue which it does not possess, and by omitting its defects can have some hope of fooling the people.

The most that is expected of this appropriation of \$50,000,000 is that it will build probably 500,000 tons of freight-carrying ships. It is estimated as low as 300,000 tons. Five hundred thousand tons, with from six to ten million tons of American ocean freight, could have no appreciable effect upon the freight rates. It does, however, take \$50,000,000 out of the people's Treasury that has already been overdrawn. Or, rather, it is proposed to mortgage, through the issue of bonds, the people's property to the extent of half a hundred million dollars.

The majority have in this Congress appropriated millions upon millions of dollars that they never would have dared to appropriate had it not been believed that they could rely upon the war emergency as an excuse. Yet I assume, Mr. President, there are very few Senators in this body who believe that the war will not be over before any one of these emergency war projects can be put in operation. If ocean freight rates are high now, and no doubt they are high, it is due entirely to the war situation. When the European conflict is over those rates will be reduced, and let it not be forgotten that all the extra ship tonnage that the United States is placing upon the sea under any circumstances would be for the benefit of men who are engaged in the shipping business, and not one dollar of benefit will accrue to the people of the United States who are to pay the taxes for buying or building these proposed boats. Indeed, the high ocean rates on our export shipments are not paid by the producers of this country, but are paid by the foreign buyer and consumer. They are obliged to have the goods and they pay the freight.

You have voted \$20,000,000 for an armor plant, a war emergency provision, and it will take at least four years, long after the war is concluded, before the expenditure of that money can be utilized in any degree by the people of the United States, and by doing this you have not insured to the Government of the United States the ability to buy this plate as cheaply even as it can be purchased now.

You have voted \$20,000,000 for a nitrate plant. It can not be operated until the war is over, when the emergency is passed.

You have expended public money like a drunken sailor. You have appropriated money that will bring, that can bring no benefit to the people, but which they must pay. You have saddled upon them a debt which they can not cancel in a generation.

This is the time for political exploitation through partisan legislation. You expect that you can go out to the people and say to them, "We are going to reduce ocean freight rates by placing upon the seas Government-built ships of 500,000 tons capacity." You will not tell them that the total tons of American freight requiring boats is 10,000,000, and that 500,000 tons will furnish the same competition to that vast amount that a canoe does to an ocean liner.

Mr. President, I do not like to be considered a scold, but the truth should be spoken and the mask of deception removed. It is time that you dealt fairly and honestly with the people of the United States, that instead of offering them an alleged benefit you know is a sham and compelling them to pay for it; instead of giving them a stone when they ask for bread, you had better be frank with yourselves and with your constituents and have some regard for the deplorable condition of the Treasury of the United States. Fifty million dollars have come to be a bagatelle in the mind of this administration, and it is in comparison with its total stupendous expenditures. The people may not agree with you in this, however, for they know that these \$50,000,000 are to be taken from them in the form of taxes, and under your Democratic policy no part of it is to be paid by the foreigner, who, after the European war is over, will be given the benefit of the American market, the same as he was given it during the 10 months before the war.

The most that could be expected from this measure, I repeat, would be to give a little benefit to a few favored shippers, because these few ships could make but few ports, those ports to be selected by the board, and, judged by the boards which have been appointed under this administration, it will certainly distribute these favors for the benefit of the faithful.

Mr. President, I would vote against this bill if I were present, because it is, in my judgment, a fraud upon the people. I am not going into the effect it might have upon private shipping and shipping interests. I do not agree with some of my colleagues on this side that the expenditure of \$50,000,000 will materially, at least at the present time, affect those interests very largely, because it is by comparison but a bagatelle. It, of course, is the recognition of a principle which, if enlarged, would be very detrimental to the interests of our country and certainly in opposition to every principle that Democracy has advocated during all its past. It is also antagonistic to an increased merchant marine. It will discourage, not encourage, shipbuilding.

I think it is time to call a halt on this game of playing to the galleries for political purposes only. There are not many Senators on the other side or on this who would propose this bill, much less would they stand on the floor and advocate it seriously, if it were not for the unsettled conditions caused by the European war at the present time. Europe is drunk with blood and the United States is intoxicated with extravagance born of war. I repeat, under your own statements and admissions practically not a ton of this freight can be put into service before the war in all reasonable probabilities will have ended. Have you not incurred enough debts already, without contracting this one?

Possibly you can buy some boats and put them into service at once, but if you buy them you take those already on the sea; you do not add to the total tonnage. You simply take so much tonnage that is already now in service from private management and put it under the management of the Government. If under its present management it is highly profitable, the owner will not sell at a price which the Government can afford to pay. If it is unprofitable now, it would be worse than foolish for the Government to purchase it.

I regret that I had not known a little earlier that the Senate was to adjourn to-day at 2 o'clock. It is now 10 minutes to 2, and I will not prevent Senators who have formal matters to present from doing so before adjournment. There are other reasons for opposing this bill than those I have given, and which I had hoped to present to the Senate; but perhaps I have said as much as I ought to have said already. I have simply voiced my own honest conviction of what the purposes of the bill are and what its results or lack of them will be. I yield now to the Senator from Idaho.

[Mr. BORAH presented petitions, which appear under the appropriate heading.]

FEDERAL FARM-LOAN ACT.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask unanimous consent to consider a resolution to print, on the basis of an estimated cost of \$500, which is the amount allowed under the law for either branch of Congress to print without a concurrent resolution, additional copies of Senate Document No. 500. It is the Federal farm-loan act annotated and indexed. There is a very great demand for it. The Federal Farm Loan Board alone this morning asked for 6,000 copies. It is a very useful document, and I should like to have it printed.

Mr. PENROSE. I do not intend to object, but I only want to hazard the observation that there are 9,000,000 people in Pennsylvania and I have not had a single request for a copy of the act. I do not think the people of Pennsylvania take a particle of interest in it, and other Senators have told me that they have not had requests from any source for it. I do not object, however.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think requests for it will come from the Senator's State. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution (S. Res. 245) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 23,300 additional copies of Senate Document No. 500, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, entitled "The Federal farm-loan act," for the use of the Senate document room.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, August 14, 1916, at 12 o'clock m.